Gift of

Library of Bishop Pike

THE FAITH OF AN ENGLISH CATHOLIC

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

A HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST. 2 vols. 8vo, **36s.** net.

OUTLINES OF CHRISTIAN DOGMA.
Crown 8vo, **10s.** net.

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.
8vo, paper covers, **1s.** net; cloth, **1s. 6d.** net.

HOLY BAPTISM. Crown 8vo, **5s.** net.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.
F'cap, sewed, **9d.** net.

THE LAW OF CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE,
especially in Relation to the Deceased Wife's Sister's Act: an Address. Crown 8vo, sewed, **6d.** net.

DIVORCE AND RE-MARRIAGE.
An Address on the Majority and Minority Reports of the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes. With an Appendix of Authorities.
Crown 8vo, sewed, **1s. 6d.** net.

WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH?
A Statement of Evidence in Criticism of a Sentence in the Appeal to all Christian People made by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, which is fundamental to all the Propositions of that Appeal.
By the Rev. Canon DARWELL STONE, D.D., Oxford; and the Rev. F. W. PULLER, M.A., S.S.J.E.
Crown 8vo, **2s. 6d.** net.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, BOMBAY,
CALCUTTA AND MADRAS

THE FAITH OF AN ENGLISH CATHOLIC

BY

DARWELL STONE, D.D.

Principal of Pusey House;
Honorary Canon of Christ Church.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C. 4.
NEW YORK, TORONTO
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS
1926

Bx
5100
S7

Made in Great Britain. *All rights reserved.*

Firmly I believe and truly
God is Three, and God is One;
And I next acknowledge duly
Manhood taken by the Son.
And I trust and hope most fully
In that Manhood crucified;
And each thought and deed unruly
Do to death, as He has died.
Simply to His grace and wholly
Light and life and strength belong,
And I love, supremely, solely,
Him the holy, Him the strong.

J. H. NEWMAN.

319733

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BELIEF IN GOD	6
III.	THE INCARNATION AND THE ATONEMENT	10
IV.	THE CHURCH	15
V.	THE SACRAMENTAL PRINCIPLE	23
VI.	BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION	30
VII.	THE MASS	34
VIII.	THE RESERVED SACRAMENT	45
IX.	CONFESSION	57
X.	UNCTION OF THE SICK	64
XI.	HOLY ORDERS	71
XII.	HOLY MATRIMONY	76
XIII.	OUR LADY AND THE SAINTS	81
XIV.	THE LAST THINGS	91
XV.	CONCLUSION	103
	INDEX	115

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

DURING the last year a demand has been somewhat insistently made that Anglo-Catholics should show their hand, and explain what they mean, and say what they want. If an attempt is made to answer the challenge, there must needs be some definition who Anglo-Catholics are, and some statement how they have come to be. The writer of this book does not love the word Anglo-Catholic. Both for linguistic and for theological reasons he would prefer to call himself an English Catholic. But the wide use of the word in popular speech makes it one which cannot be avoided, and to which even those who could have wished for another phrase must consent. It is indeed not new. Besides the older use of it, the Tractarians called themselves by this name, and their critics so described them ;[1] and this fact may serve to illustrate features in the history of what is known as Anglo-Catholicism to-day. For the Anglo-Catholics of to-day are the successors of the men who nearly one hundred years ago began and carried through the Oxford Movement.

The Oxford Movement was the result of many different causes, some remote, some near at hand. It was affected by many different influences. The

[1] See, among many other instances, J. H. Newman, *Tracts for the Times*, no. xc (1841), p. 25 ; C. Brontë, *Shirley* (1849), i, p. 1.

promoters and supporters of it included men of very different history and character and attainments. In its sources and in its history there were diversities. But there was one great desire which pervaded the earliest stages of the whole Movement; and, with whatever modifications in details or effects, remained all along. This great desire was to find and express the true authority for theological belief and church organization and religious life. In seeking this authority the Tractarians tried to see the facts and the meaning of history. They looked back to antiquity. They sought to know what was the tradition which the Church of the first centuries had received from the Apostles, to see how it was sustained by Holy Scripture, to understand how the ancient Church had given it expression and form. There was one way—the way of truth, the way of worship, the way of holiness—which once for all had been committed to the saints, which was the abiding inheritance of the Church on earth. It was the gift of God, not made but received by man. It was in sharp contrast to the many forms of error, the many kinds of perverted devotion, the many undisciplined phases of life, which human sin and mistake had brought to be. To strengthen the teaching of the dogma inherited from the earliest centuries was the right means of opposing the inroads of unbelief. The Oxford writers made their appeal to the Church of the Fathers and the Church of the New Testament; they regarded the historic Catholic Church as the teacher of truth and the home of grace; and, beyond all that they gained for belief and worship, they tried to rekindle and renew the spiritual significance of our Lord's earthly life.

As time went on, two new features came into the Movement. In its beginnings it was intellectual and largely academical. Notwithstanding the desire to promote goodness, which had been strong from the first, and the deep sympathy with all sorts and conditions of men, which had never been absent, the character of its appeal necessarily made it the work of the learned and the refined, and necessarily it found its chief response among those who possessed well equipped and cultivated minds. But it soon found fuller scope. Soon the supporters of it were no longer confined to narrow circles. They moved out into wider spheres of Church activity. The work of the Movement went on in parishes filled with poor and ignorant people; and the missionary enterprise which had always been very near to the heart of the Movement expanded in practical work of many kinds at home and abroad. When this expansion took place, new needs of practical urgency were felt, and could not be resisted. As one result, the warmth and brightness of a beautiful and appealing and impressive ceremonial was added to the original austerity. That which had been known as Tractarian came to be called Ritualistic. London and other centres, as well as Oxford, began to have their say.

The other new feature also was the result of a widening influence. The earliest appeal had been to the ancient Church and the Scripture behind it, and in a less degree to that preservation of the earliest tradition which, it was believed, might be found in the authorized formularies and the great divines of the English Church since the Reformation. As the facts were studied, a sense of isolation made itself felt. The Church of England, alone, exclusive, separated from other

Christians in all parts of the world, seemed very different from the Church of the Fathers with its wide extent and far reaching influence, which was Catholic not only because it was orthodox but also because it was the Church of the whole world. And, on another line of thought, it was seen that the Churches of the East and the Church of Rome could no longer be merely condemned or lightly ignored, but must be taken into serious account. Hence came a desire to find out all that was good in Roman and Eastern theology and life, to search for agreement rather than for difference, to adapt and use the principles and methods of Roman and Eastern thought and devotion. The study of theologians who gave allegiance to Rome was added to that of the Reformation and post-Reformation English divines. Ways of prayer and worship and work were modelled on much which had not hitherto been known in the English Church. Retreats, missions, systems of meditation, services of which the Three Hours is a notable instance, were given a place in English Church life. The claim of the English Church to be a true part of the Catholic Church had already been strongly emphasized; and the desire for reunion with the East and with Rome, which had never been quite extinguished, gradually grew in intensity and determination and force.

From this origin and this development those who are now known as Anglo-Catholics have come to be. They are a large company. Among them there are wide differences. They do not form a mechanically organized party. Many of them are suspicious of any kind of direction and control, very sensitive to any kind of interference. Many of them are so far touched by the spirit of the age as to claim independence of

ction to a very large extent. Some words of the ccomplished historian Mr. Henry Offley Wakeman re even more true now than when he wrote them in 896. " Since 1845 the High Church revival has never een the work of a party within the Church. High hurchmen have never been like an army organized nder definite and authoritative leadership, still less ke a parliamentary group, which answers obediently o the crack of the whip. Their common action has een constantly marked by much independence of hought and practice."[1]

But, if there are differences among Anglo-Catholics, here is much more that unites. And what unites is ndamental. Mr. Wakeman's further words are true gain of those to-day, as they were of those of an arlier time. " Still less," he continues, " have they een a disorderly mob, actuated merely by frivolity nd passion. They have been rather like one of the reat political parties under a constitutional govern- ent, men united in common action by a belief in ommon principles, held in very varying degrees of tensity and perspective, but clear enough in their ain outlines."[2]

In the following pages the writer must try to show hat Anglo-Catholics have in common, and wherein ey differ; how far they have inherited the position f the Tractarians, from whom they sprang, and how r they have altered or supplemented it; what is eir relation to the Church of England as a whole, nd to the Catholic Church throughout the world.

[1] H. O. Wakeman, *An Introduction to the History of the Church of England* (ninth edition, 1919), p. 470.
[2] *Ibid.*

CHAPTER II

BELIEF IN GOD

IT is easy for a casual visitor to an Anglo-Catholic church to make great mistakes. He observes, perhaps, a pageant of worship, careful attention to minute details, regard for symmetry. He listens, perhaps, to strong assertions about sacramental grace, to some panegyric of our Lady or the saints, to emphatic insistence on the more outward aspects of Christian duty. He is, it may be, given an impression of formalism or unreality. If to some extent he appreciates the splendour or the exactness or the regularity, he may in other ways be repelled, and he may miss much of the real meaning of what he sees and hears, and may fail to understand what is behind it. It is easy to know a man for years and even to talk much with him, and yet not to understand what is nearest to his heart and what he cares for most. It is easy, again, to know a man from his public reputation, and to have formed an unfavourable opinion of him, and later somehow to find that the man himself is most conscious of and most deplores the faults which to the outsider have obscured the real beauty and power of his life. In some such way, one who has looked at the outside only of Anglo-Catholic teaching and worship may sometimes have seen formality, superficiality, harshness, narrowness, where these really

are not ; and have failed to discern what is behind and beyond the external features which he has observed. For devotion to the great truths of the Christian religion is the essential element in Anglo-Catholic life.

Central among the great truths of the Christian religion is the doctrine of God. By a long process, extending through the books of the Old and the New Testaments, the Christian doctrine of God was developed. It was asserted or implied in the decisions of the Church, and was elaborated in the common thought and teaching of the Christian divines.

The Christian belief in God regards Him as eternal, as transcending the universe which He created no less than immanent in it, as distinct in nature from the highest of His creatures, as possessing the moral perfection whereby He includes in Himself all possible good, as able to do all things which do not contradict His own being and attributes. He is supreme love. He is pitiful, He is merciful, He is full of long-suffering, He is One the ascription to whom of grief for human ills fails only because it is true in a sense higher than any known in man. He has all that is most loving in a parent's care. But He has also in supreme measure other attributes of a good father. He is not without sternness. As He has grief and pity in senses far surpassing the human meaning of the words, so also He has righteous wrath. The Catholic tradition has steadfastly kept the assertion of those widely differing qualities in the divine life which Holy Scripture in rich abundance reveals.

Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics[1] have held this

[1] It will be convenient in this book to adopt the popular usage by which " Tractarians " denotes the earlier generation, and " Anglo-Catholics " their successors at the present time. Properly speaking, the words are interchangeable ; see p. 1, above.

tradition fast. It may be true that there have been differences between them. In the Tractarians, awe and reverence and an intense recollection of responsibility may sometimes have taken the wrong form of gloom. Among Anglo-Catholics the dread of gloom, rightly recognized as often strengthening temptation and leading to sin, may sometimes have seemed to lessen the sense of responsibility and reverence and awe. So far as this has been so, the differences have been due to differing imperfections as the pendulum has swung first one way and then another; they have not been the result of any fault in the fundamental belief. In an age when there are many tendencies to ignore God, or to regard His Being as not essentially distinct from that of man, or so to pervert the idea of His Fatherhood as to minimize the thought of Him as the almighty Ruler and the righteous Judge, there is need of the great truths about God which are common to Tractarian and Anglo-Catholic alike.

The central truth about God is the assertion of His love. His love is not limited to time. It is a part of His eternal Being, existing, real, active, before the work of creation began. Through eternity the life of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost has been. The love of the Father for the Son, of the Son for the Father, of the Father and the Son for the Holy Ghost, of the Holy Ghost for the Father and the Son, had no beginning, as it will have no end. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity—of the three Persons who are one God—was seen by the Church to be necessarily implied in the teaching of Holy Scripture, and was made part of the constant message of Christian truth. In their emphasis on this doctrine Catholic theologians endeavoured to meet the deepest needs of Christian thought

and devotion. For these needs cannot be satisfied save in the God who is eternal, in whose eternal Being there are the activities of life, and in whose life before as well as after creation is an abiding exercise of love. A theology which departs from the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which Tractarian and Anglo-Catholic have received from the Universal Church, may have a temporary attraction ; but its failure to satisfy the abiding demands of human thought and prayer deprives it of real and lasting value.

CHAPTER III

THE INCARNATION AND THE ATONEMENT

THE Old Testament leads up to, and the New Testament records, the fact of the Incarnation. The Church has clearly expressed the teaching of Holy Scripture, and the inferences which must be drawn if the assertions contained in Holy Scripture are to be maintained. In the Incarnation the Son of God became Man. He is Himself the eternal Son, who possessed throughout eternity the fulness of Godhead, who is Himself God equally with the Father. In his incarnate life He remains all that He has always been. There is no abandonment, no lessening of His divine life. Throughout the most splendid, and throughout the most lowly, acts and sufferings of His human life He is really and fully God. And the human life which He takes to be His own is no less real and no less complete than His divine Being. In it He Himself, the eternal Son of God, is conceived and born, lives as child and man, is tempted and suffers, dies and is buried. He has in all fulness body and mind and spirit with all their organs and faculties. Of these organs and faculties there is real exercise, properly human, in His acts and sufferings. To the two co-ordinate truths of His Godhead and His manhood the Church is pledged. To make Him anything less than God even in the deepest humiliations of His

human life, or to make Him not fully Man at any time since the beginning of His human life, is to slip into heresy. The one Being, the Son of God, is really, completely, inseparably, indissolubly, God and Man. As God and Man He is the supreme example of human life, He is able to make atonement for human sin, and He can unite human beings to Himself.

The human life of the Son of God has a miraculous character both in itself and in its effects. He was the Son of a Virgin Mother, He wrought many miracles, He rose from the dead. It is as fitting as it is reasonable that He who is God as well as Man should be, even in His human life, more than He would have been had He been only Man.

There are subtle and difficult questions about the relations of the divine and the human natures in our Lord, about the influence of His divine Being on His human knowledge and the capacity of His human mind to receive from His Godhead, about the effects of His divine power on His human weakness and of His human weakness on the exercise of His divine power. Such questions, which have been discussed by the Schoolmen of the middle ages and by modern theologians, are altogether outside the scope of this book. About them there are differences of opinion among Anglo-Catholics, as there were among the Fathers and the Schoolmen and the Tractarians; but these are differences which are found together with the agreement that the incarnate Son of God is one Christ, true God and true Man.

Theologians have differed as to the relation of the Incarnation to the Fall. The answer to the question whether the Son of God would have become Man if man had not sinned was one of the many points of

disagreement between the two chief groups of the mediæval Schoolmen. In the time of the Tractarians the question was not prominent, and differences about it on the part of those who had considered it do not seem to have excited much attention or caused any alarm. A little later it was much discussed in England. Interest in it has again become less, and it is not likely that any considerable number of Anglo-Catholics would attach great importance to it.

Whether it be true or untrue that the Son of God would have become Man if man had not sinned, the Incarnation as it actually took place was a remedy for sin. The sin for which a cure was thus found included both the original sin which is the result of inheritance and the sin which men in their own lives commit. To study the history of the doctrine of original sin affords one of the most fascinating as well as one of the most difficult of inquiries. It is of absorbing interest to observe how what attracts one mind repels another, how what to one seems dictated by strict reasoning appears altogether unreasonable to another. The differences are not new any more than the facts of life and the characteristics of temperament which suggest them. Anglo-Catholics can hardly ask that, where so great divergencies have existed in the Church all along, there should be complete uniformity of opinion in their own ranks. But they can agree that, whether or not a fuller meaning is to be attached to original sin, human nature as it now comes into the world at the conception and birth of a child is not as it ought to be and as it might have been, but is at the least impaired by a defect and a weakness which are due to that sin in the past which is known as the Fall.

It was an object, then of the Incarnation to cure original sin, to supply the help which man needed even apart from the sins which individual men commit. But the needs of human life, as it was at the time of the Incarnation and as it still is, are far greater than the mere removal of original sin. The study of history and attention to contemporary events alike show the failure of mankind as it is illustrated by evil deeds and by good left undone. While original sin may not be left out of account, actual sin presents one of the chief problems of life.

The Incarnation is the answer of God to man's conviction that he needs help. For it is through the Incarnation that the Atonement is wrought. The life and death of our Lord have atoning power. In Him human life at its best and noblest, human life without sin and with moral perfection, makes an offering in dedicating itself so supremely to the will of God the Father that the sacrifice does not stop short of willing death. Were it only a human sacrifice, it would have high value. But it is not only a human sacrifice. It is the sacrifice of Him who, besides being Man, is also God. And therefore the efficacy of it is not only that efficacy which it might have from complete self-surrender, perfect self-sacrifice. Besides all that it might thus possess, it has also the power of God. It is true that the nature of the Atonement is not defined in Holy Scripture. It is true that on this subject the authorized formularies of the Catholic Church have maintained a deep reserve. But neither Holy Scripture nor the official theology of the Church can be satisfied with less than a doctrine which sees in the Atonement the loving provision of God the Father for the sinful human race, and the

powerful act of God the Son made Man by means of which there is forgiveness for the sins of men. In their insistence on this truth Anglo-Catholics are in harmony with their Tractarian predecessors as well as with the Evangelical precursors and contemporaries of the Tractarians.

The offering of Himself by our Lord did not end with His death on the cross. His death was the prelude to His resurrection, and the resurrection was the prelude to His ascension and heavenly life. In glory at the right hand of the Father He is a priest on His throne. His offering continually pleaded is an abiding sacrifice, the sacrifice of Himself. The commemoration which Christians make of His work for them is a commemoration of the Lord Himself, and therefore of all the acts and sufferings of His human life, and notably of His passion and death, His resurrection and ascension, His session on His throne in heaven.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHURCH

THE redemption of mankind was accomplished by our Lord when in the ascension He presented to the Father His finished work. But the results of that work had yet to be developed and applied. As the ascension followed on from the death and resurrection, so also the ascension itself led to the descent of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost, the third Person in the Holy Trinity, who had always since the creation had His work on earth, was now sent by God the Son from God the Father in a new manner and with new operations. The people of God, who in Old Testament times had received God's special vocation, and had been in special fashion the instrument of His will, was now to be filled with new power. The little remnant of the chosen race, which had been faithful in the supreme crisis of the vocation, and had accepted our Lord as the Messiah, and had become His disciples, inherited the promises to the race, and was made to be the Christian Church, and was filled with the Holy Ghost.

The Church thus formed was the instrument of God. It had its divinely appointed work of teaching and hallowing those who through its missionary efforts should become Christians. As the teacher of truth and the home of grace, it was, in the power of the

Holy Ghost, to make the gifts of God through the Incarnation effective in human lives. On its outward side, it was a company of men and women and children united in a fellowship of life and prayer which was sustained by the teaching of the apostles and by sacramental grace. In its inward being, it was the bride and body of Christ, the shrine of the Holy Ghost, the family of God. As time went on and the Church grew, its limits were clearly seen. The members of the Church were those who believed the orthodox faith, who had been baptized into the body of Christ, and who continued in communion with the episcopal ministry which had descended from the apostles.

The Church is the teacher of truth. The method of its teaching may take different forms. There is the promulgation of Holy Scripture. There are the decisions of Councils. There are the utterances of accredited teachers. There are the necessary inferences from worship. In each case what is important is how far that which is taught is the right and permanent expression of the Church's mind.

In promulging Holy Scripture the Church has given Holy Scripture a very distinctive place. Phrases such as that Holy Scripture is the word of God, or that God is the author of Holy Scripture, or that through Holy Scripture the Holy Ghost spoke, have been frequently used, and have been accepted with a greater or less degree of authority. The written word of God has often been compared with the personal Word of God in such a way as to suggest some correspondence between the revelation in Holy Scripture and the revelation in the Incarnation. With these expressions a pronounced view of the authority of Holy Scripture has been associated for a long period

of time and by very many teachers. The absence of error has been asserted. Each word of the original texts has been said to be inspired in the sense that, if the record was designed as history, the history is necessarily true in every detail; if statements are figurative, the facts or doctrines represented by the figures are wholly accurate; if there is teaching, the teaching cannot contain any mistake. The tendency has been to minimize the human element in the books, and towards making the divine inspiration almost all. Such a view of Holy Scripture was the most usual way of regarding it in the early Church. There were important exceptions, but it was the opinion of most of the Fathers. It passed from them into the theology of the middle ages. In the sixteenth century it received a new emphasis; for, while retained both by Roman Catholics and by the Reformers as a whole, the stress on it became greater in Protestant quarters because among Protestants there was less use of the mystical interpretation which had somewhat lightened the burden of the theory for the Fathers and the mediæval writers. The Tractarians inherited and did not question this general way of regarding the Bible. And they accepted with it as a matter of course the traditional ascription of the books of the Bible to particular writers, and the traditional view of the composition of the books. The last century has been a time of much study of the Bible, a time of vehemently maintained and passionately attacked theories, a time in which almost every received opinion on the subject has been challenged. The effect of all this has been seen in the successors of the Tractarians. There is probably no matter on which there is more difference among Anglo-Catholics to-day than the questions

about Holy Scripture. The opinions of some differ little from those of the majority of the Fathers or the Schoolmen or the Reformers. Others have accepted theories affected by the historical and critical methods of the time, and have found no difficulty in fitting new opinions about the composition and the authorship and the interpretation of the books of Holy Scripture into their theological beliefs. In this respect, perhaps, more than any other, many Anglo-Catholics have departed far from the mind of the Tractarians, as also they are far removed from the most authoritative teachers of the Church of Rome. It may not be without significance that a similar change of position appears to be taking place among the Evangelicals in the English Church.

Some change, though not so great a change as in regard to Holy Scripture, may be seen also in the attitude of the Anglo-Catholics towards the authority of the Church in general as compared with that of the Tractarians. Both alike affirm the complete authority of decisions of Councils universally accepted which have defined doctrines as being of obligatory belief, and the high importance of the uniform teaching of representative theologians, and the high value of inferences which may be drawn from worship found everywhere within the Church. But a difference may be seen in the reasons because of which these conclusions are received. By the Tractarians, for the most part, universality of belief or practice was valued chiefly because it was regarded as a sign of apostolicity, because it was a witness to the tradition which had been handed down in the Church from the first. Many Anglo-Catholics, on the other hand, regard universal consent within the Church as in itself the result of the

divine guidance; and attach importance no less to a providential development than to the preservation of a tradition committed to the Church by the apostles. This difference of attitude brings with it another difference also. For the Tractarian, the older a doctrine or practice, the nearer is it to what is true and right, because it is less far removed from the time of the apostles; and the appeal to antiquity is one of the most marked features of the Tractarian teaching. For many Anglo-Catholics the appeal to antiquity has less weight than other considerations; and, if there be universal acceptance within the Church, it is not for them a matter of serious moment whether that acceptance is found in the fifth century or in the first half of the eleventh.

There can be little doubt that in the ancient Church the Bishop of Rome held a very remarkable, and, in some respects, a unique position. He was regarded as the chief Bishop in Christendom; he had a primacy which, if undefined, was not unimportant; it was natural for him to initiate inquiries and to promulgate the results of inquiries. In the course of time, the influence and power of the Popes increased; their claims became greater; the tendency was for the primacy to pass into a supremacy. The supremacy of the Pope and the necessity of communion with him for membership in the Church were maintained by the Popes in the fifth century and later; through the middle ages this supremacy and necessity were usually acknowledged in the West; and in the nineteenth century belief in the infallibility of papal decisions for the whole Church on matters of faith and morals, which had already been held by many, was made obligatory for those in communion with the See of Rome.

The Tractarians were not concerned to deny that the Pope had possessed some kind of primacy in the ancient Church, and that, if Christendom should once more be united, he would again naturally be the primate of the universal Church; but papal supremacy and the necessity of communion with the Pope as a condition of communion with the Church were rejected by all of them except those who became Roman Catholics. Those who were still alive in 1870, the year when papal infallibility was defined, continued to deny that doctrine. Among Anglo-Catholics of to-day there are considerable differences in the attitude taken towards the papacy. The position of some is much the same as that most characteristic of the Tractarians. But with many there has been a certain change of outlook. Probably there are but few who are so far inconsistent in remaining within the English Church that they are ready to acknowledge the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope; but there are many who have come to recognize more fully and cordially that in the light of history the Pope may claim a primacy in the Church, and some of these are willing to assert that this primacy has a degree of divine right or divine authority which others would not allow.

During the last fifty years the desire for the re-union of Christendom, which had never become quite extinct in the English Church, has grown steadily stronger. It is felt by all Anglo-Catholics; and most of them agree that, whatever possibilities there may be with Protestant Dissenters, union with Rome and the East is of chief importance, and is the most likely to lead eventually to the re-union of all Christians. Some —probably the considerable majority—regard the prospects of re-union with Rome as more hopeful

than the prospects of re-union with the East, and attach most value to such a reconciliation as will make Western Catholics one united Church under the primacy of the Pope. Others hold the contrary view that for the present our hopes should be extended rather to the Churches of the East. All these alike would wish that the first partial re-union—whether with Rome or with the East—should be a step towards a union which may include all Catholics of the West and Orthodox of the East, and finally gather into itself all Christian societies.

The wish for, and the anticipation of, re-union have a practical bearing on policy. Nothing ought to be denied to Rome by England or the East which Rome can rightly claim in the light of Scripture and history and dogma, and nothing ought to be granted to Rome of which Scripture and history and dogma demand the rejection. Sacrifices on all sides will be needed if the great work is to be accomplished ; but they must be sacrifices in which no Catholic principle is on any side abandoned.

The hope of re-union has its bearing, too, on the appeal to authority. Authority has taken a somewhat different form in the East and at Rome, and again in the Church of England. In each of them, also, there have been different conceptions of freedom. It is important, if re-union is to be sound and lasting, that nothing which is of value either in the way of authority or in the way of freedom should be lost, and that nothing which is useless or hurtful should be retained.

The Catholic appeal to authority is partly to the past. It looks back to Holy Scripture, to the doctrinal statements in which the Church has drawn out

the meaning of Holy Scripture and which have been accepted as creeds, to the conciliar decisions which have been authoritatively imposed as binding on the whole Church, to the common teaching of representative divines. The Catholic may not reject anything to which he believes that the Church as a whole is really committed, anything which the whole Church has made part of its permanent life. It may often be a difficult task to determine exactly how far the authority of the Church has gone, whether the decision of an accepted œcumenical council has been so completely a matter of principle that it may not be altered or has been so entirely a detail of only temporary importance that it may well be changed, whether, for instance, any utterance is to be ranked with the affirmation of our Lord's deity at the Council of Nicæa or with the prohibition of kneeling during Eastertide by the same council, whether the concurrent teaching of divines through a long period of time indicates an actual acceptance of the teaching by the Church itself. But, whenever it can be determined that there has been a decision to which the Church as a whole is permanently committed, the acceptance of that decision is obligatory.

But, besides the appeal to the past, there is also an appeal to the future. The Catholic of necessity looks back to the past; for in the past is the tradition which sustains his belief. But of necessity also he looks forward to the future, to the re-united Church which is to be, and he sees that the past will find its full significance in the development which yet has to come. For the Church's life is greater than of any one century, or of any particular series of centuries; it is for all time.

CHAPTER V

THE SACRAMENTAL PRINCIPLE

A MARKED feature in Anglo-Catholic thought is the value assigned to the sacramental principle. In the sacraments material things are used as means of spiritual processes. This is in accordance with the use of matter in all religion. Prayer and communion with God find expression by means of the material brain, and a further expression in the speech which the body makes possible. Spiritual instinct and thought might indeed exist without the brain or any organs of speech ; but, at any rate in our present state of existence, they would be greatly limited and hindered.

The Incarnation supremely illustrated the sacramental principle. It showed that, whatever the ravages of sin, matter had not become necessarily evil, had not lost the capacity of being used for good which God had given to it in the creation. For in becoming Man the eternal Son of God made the whole of human nature His own, and took a human body no less than a human soul as the dwelling place and instrument of His divine Being, indissolubly one with Himself. In His body and by means of His body He lived and taught and worked miracles. In His body and by means of His body He redeemed mankind. He indeed received that body without taint of sin from His

virgin mother. But His body was as really material as is the body of anyone of ourselves, and in the work of His incarnate life He used this material body to accomplish the highest spiritual ends.

As it was in the Incarnation, so it is in the sacraments. The end is spiritual but there are material means. The water of Baptism is applied by a bodily hand, and words are spoken by a bodily voice; and the soul of the baptized person receives spiritual benefit. In Confirmation the recipient of the sacrament is touched by the hand or is anointed with oil, and the spiritual strength of the sacrament is received. In the Holy Eucharist words are spoken in regard to bread and wine, and the bread and wine are themselves spiritually transformed and become means of spiritual grace to those who use and receive them. In Penance words spoken by the mouth are the instrument for spiritual forgiveness. In the Unction of the Sick, spiritual blessings are conveyed through the use of material oil. In Orders the laying on of hands and the words of the Bishop are used by the Holy Ghost to empower the ordained with spiritual gifts. In Matrimony the outward contract is so blessed by God that the relation of the married to one another is spiritual as well as bodily.

The sacraments are not magical. Unlike the processes of magic, they are not used to bend an unwilling god to the will of the worshippers. Rather, they are the provision of the loving God, who wills by means of them to help His creatures. Unlike the processes of magic, they are not devised to produce mechanical effects in those who use them. There are indeed objective results. Those who are baptized or confirmed or ordained are and must remain baptized or confirmed

or ordained persons even though there is no spiritual response in them to the administration of the sacrament. But the lack of spiritual desires in the case of an adult prevents him from being spiritually benefited by the sacramental gift. The consecrated bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ even if the officiating priest is faithless, and if the recipients are without repentance for wilful sin. But the reception of spiritual benefit is dependent on the presence of right conditions in the soul. In the middle ages, when the insistence on the objective value of the sacraments was at its height, the terror of unworthy reception ran like a nightmare through theology and devotion. "Let it not be to me for judgement and condemnation" are words which express a thought constantly found and deeply felt. And, moreover, throughout the middle ages the notion of magic was rejected in the habitual teaching that, when sacramental communion cannot be received, all the benefits of it may be obtained by a communion wholly spiritual.

The sacramental principle, then, involves the use of material things as means of spiritual processes in a way that is not magical. Another element in the principle is the value of priesthood. The idea of priesthood is very deep in human life. In ordinary affairs, one human being represents another, and one human being helps another. The State, the society, the family, the great man, the father, the mother, afford instances at every turn. In religion the same principle is at work. The priest is the representative of God to man, and the representative of man to God. The priest is the helper by whom the oblations of man are offered to God, and by whom the gifts of God are conveyed to man. The priest is between man and God

not as one who severs or interrupts or divides but as one who conveys those appointed means of divine succour which are the stay and strength of the inner and unseen communion of the soul with God. Again, the rites are not magical. There is power in them which is not of man but of God. There is grace in them which man could not create. The power and the grace call out what is best in man himself. They make demands on his whole being and challenge the strength of his spiritual resources. In themselves always the same, their effects in those who receive them are proportionate to the good will and the right desire of the recipients.

Further, the sacramental principle is the principle of society. Hebrew and Greek alike knew that it is not good for man to be alone, and that man is a social animal. Individuals realize their proper being in community with others. One does not stand alone, and he does not fall alone. He is dependent on the help of his fellows. He is affected both by his predecessors and by his contemporaries. There is no such thing as a wholly self-contained life. And the sacraments are social. In Baptism God admits the baptized into a society. In Confirmation God strengthens the social relation. In Communion God unites communicants with one another as well as with Himself. In Penance God restores the social life which sin had broken. In Unction, in Orders, in Matrimony, God treats the soul as one living and dying in the life of a society. There is nothing lost of that which is individual. Each one is as near to God and as much the object of His personal care as if there were no other. But, as in human societies, the life of the one is en-

riched by his union with others in the divine society of the Church.

There are many analogies between the Christian sacraments and the Jewish rites which were their precursors. In particular, the Christian sacraments, like the Jewish rites, are symbols. But they are symbols of a far higher kind, of fuller significance, of greater power. For they are filled with the force of the incarnate life of the Son of God and with the strength of the Pentecostal gifts of the Holy Ghost. They are symbols with that rich meaning in which the word symbol was used in the ancient Church,[1] and not in the bare and narrow sense given to the word by many Protestant divines. They effect that which they signify. They renew those who receive them. In the case of one of them, the Holy Eucharist, the sacrament itself is transformed.

All this is the commonplace of Catholic theology. The Tractarians found the doctrine of the sacramental principle in Holy Scripture and in the tradition of the Church. This doctrine gave to their teaching its life and its power. The Anglo-Catholics have inherited the doctrine from the Tractarians. For them, as for the Tractarians, it takes its place in the ordered sequence of a true theology, following from the dogmas of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, and leading on to the doctrines and the use of the separate sacraments.

The sacramental principle is of vital importance.

[1] See, e.g., K. R. Hagenbach, *A History of Christian Doctrines* (English translation, 1880), i, 286-297; A. Harnack, *History of Dogma* (English translation, 1896), ii, 144, 145: iv, 289, note 2; C. H. Turner in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vii, 595-7 (1906); and the present writer's *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (1909), i, 29-31, 61-67.

Questions about the number of the sacraments have often been given an undue prominence. The answers to those questions depend on definition and terminology. In the ancient Church, the use of the word was so wide that the Incarnation itself was described as a sacrament, and that, on the other hand, the word was applied to the salt given to catechumens. As the use was narrowed, and there was a tendency to limit the number to seven, theologians did not at first agree as to the details of inclusion. From the twelfth century in the West, and considerably later in the East, it became customary to describe Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Unction, Orders, and Matrimony as sacraments to the exclusion of other rites. This terminology has great and obvious convenience. It is in accordance with the usual practice of the East and the West. It groups together a set of rites which are akin. It makes teaching about the sacraments easier. It avoids the difficulties which hamper either a wider or a narrower use. But no Catholic theologian would deny great differences among the seven. Baptism and the Eucharist stand out from the rest as ascribed in the Gospels to the express institution of our Lord with visible signs attached, and as necessary for all Christians in a degree and to an extent to which other sacraments are not necessary. Differences are asserted between sacraments of the living, which are for the use of those already in grace, namely, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Unction, Orders, Matrimony, and sacraments of the dead, which are for those who are not yet in grace or who have fallen from it, namely, Baptism and Penance. Another line of division is between sacraments which confer "character" and cannot be repeated, namely, Baptism, Confirmation,

Orders, and those which do not confer "character" and therefore can be repeated, namely, the Eucharist, Penance, Unction, Matrimony. In the course of their study of the ancient Church and of contemporary Catholicism, the Tractarians came to recognize the sacramental nature of the seven rites; and it is the habitual practice of most Anglo-Catholics to speak of the seven sacraments, namely, the two greater, Baptism and the Eucharist, and the five less, Confirmation, Penance, Unction, Orders, Matrimony.

CHAPTER VI

BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION

BAPTISM is the first of the sacraments. In one sense it is the greatest, because, though the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ surpasses it in dignity, it is the condition for the reception of all other sacraments, and through it God gives the first and the permanent sacramental union of the Christian with the human nature of our Lord. As the first to be received, it is the gate or door of sacramental life, and it supplies the foundation on which the sacramental life is built. Through it the beginning of the covenanted Christian life of grace is made. The baptized receive at their Baptism the specifically Christian gifts of God. They are made members of Christ, they are united to Him in His human nature, they are incorporated in His human life. Being members of Him who is the eternal Son of God, they are made children of God; and they receive the Holy Ghost, by whom His human nature is indwelt.

It is not denied that all men everywhere are children of God by creation, or that the Holy Ghost works outside the limits of the baptized, or that there are gifts of what theologians call "actual grace" in those who have not been brought within the covenant by Christian Baptism. The statements of Catholic theology are affirmations, not denials. They are positive

assertions of the great gifts with their distinctive value which are bestowed by means of Baptism. The sonship by creation is raised to a nobler sonship, the work of the Holy Ghost has a more intimate character, there is "habitual grace," as well as "actual grace," in the baptized.

The connexion of Confirmation with Baptism is very close. In the ancient Church, as still in the East, they were administered in normal cases as two parts of one great rite. The Western restriction of the minister in Confirmation to a Bishop, while the Easterns were content that a presbyter should confirm with chrism which a Bishop had blessed, led to a separation of Confirmation from Baptism in the West in those cases in which a Bishop did not baptize. By the sixteenth century it had become rare in the West for Baptism and Confirmation to be administered at the same time, and for infants to be confirmed; and the practice of the ancient Church was rarely maintained except when the child of some great person was baptized. In the sixteenth century the Church of Rome and the Church of England altered the law of the Church so as to make it conform with the custom which had become usual, and definitely separated Confirmation from Baptism, and restricted Confirmation to those who had reached years of discretion.

The gift in Confirmation is the gift of the Holy Ghost. On this rudimentary statement there is general agreement among the Tractarians and among the Anglo-Catholics of to-day. But the close connexion of Baptism and Confirmation in early times and through a long period of the Church's history makes a more explicit answer difficult. The discussion whether at Baptism the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, who then

comes to the soul chiefly to cleanse, is bestowed, so that in Confirmation there is a renewal of the same indwelling chiefly for the purposes of strengthening, or whether in Baptism the Holy Ghost works on the soul from without and does not indwell the soul till the administration of Confirmation, has divided many who in most matters are agreed. If it is the opinion of the present writer that on the whole the evidence from Holy Scripture and from tradition favours the belief that the soul of the baptized, even before Confirmation, possesses the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, he is aware that the contrary opinion is held by many Catholics whose learning and ability he must greatly respect.

Since the sixteenth century the age at which Confirmation has been administered in the Church of England has in a large majority of cases been greater than that at which it has usually been administered in the Church of Rome, and the tendency in the rules made by the Bishops has been to prevent the Confirmation of any who have not reached the age of at least twelve or thirteen years. Different reasons have led Anglo-Catholics to regret, and in some cases to resist, this tendency. The unprimitive character of the practice by which both the Church of Rome and the Church of England have refused Confirmation to infants has been more fully realized. It has become better understood that the Church of England, in requiring the confirmed to have come to years of discretion and to be able to say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and to be instructed in the Church Catechism, does not order an age anything like so old as thirteen ; and that in the Church of Rome children of seven years old are habitually confirmed

without any apparent ill results. The experience of parish priests and the researches of scientific educationalists have concurred to show that the practical advantages of the younger age are great. Hence, Anglo-Catholics in general are strongly in favour of an age for Confirmation much younger than that which is usual in the Church of England, though it is not likely that more than a few of them agree with the present writer in his opinion that the departure of the Church of England and the Church of Rome from the practice of the ancient Church by postponing Confirmation is unjustifiable. Speaking for himself alone, he must express his belief that it would be easier to justify at the bar of Scripture and history and reason either the administration of both Baptism and Confirmation to infants or the postponement of both till years of discretion than the present method of the Roman Catholic or the English Church.

CHAPTER VII

THE MASS

IN the transformation of worship which has taken place in the English Church during the last hundred years the most noticeable and the most important changes are in regard to the Holy Eucharist. And an outsider who should study the notice boards or visit the services of an Anglo-Catholic church might quickly infer that in this service he would see what those in charge of the church regarded as the chief part of their worship.

A hundred years ago it was very rare for the Holy Eucharist to be celebrated every Sunday; in some churches the celebration was once a month; in many it was less often. For the celebration of it many who had been present at the Morning Prayer and Litany and Ante-Communion service left the church, and only those who were intending to communicate remained. It was celebrated without external signs of dignity. To all this the Anglo-Catholic church of to-day supplies the greatest possible contrast. The word Mass is freely used. Mass is celebrated, or there are more Masses than one, every day. The solemn High Mass, or, when ministers for that are not available, a Mass sung without deacon and sub-deacon, is the chief service on Sundays. In addition to this, when there are sufficient priests, there are Low Masses

at various times. While communicants are many, there are many also who are present without at the time communicating. Everything that can add external dignity and beauty to the service is used.

This great difference has been reached through a long process. The earlier Tractarians promoted greater frequency of celebrations and more comely methods of worship. As the Tractarian movement became less academical and more parochial, changes rapidly took place, through which the present state of affairs has been reached.

During the different stages of this process the reason for the changes which have been made has been always the same. Behind ceremony there has been doctrine. The Eucharistic vestments—the amice, alb, girdle, maniple, stole, chasuble—afford a convenient instance. The use of them has been restored, partly because it was believed that this use was in obedience to the directions of the Book of Common Prayer, and partly because these vestments illustrated the continuity of the present English Church with the pre-Reformation English Church, but much more because they were felt to be an outward sign that in fundamental doctrine the Church of England to-day is at one with the rest of the Catholic Church in the past and in the present.[1]

The teaching of Eucharistic doctrine, which had almost vanished out of the English Church, was a large part of the work accomplished by the Tractarians. They accepted and kept all that was of positive value in what they received from earlier times. The sense

[1] The retention of some of the vestments by Lutherans probably was not known to most of those who were earliest in restoring the use of the vestments in the Church of England. When it was known, it was regarded as a mere survival, not affecting what was felt, as mentioned above.

of the awe which surrounded the Holy Sacrament, the recognition of the great responsibilities involved in receiving it, the conviction that special preparation must precede and special thanksgiving must follow the reception whenever these were possible, the belief that in the Holy Communion the devout soul made remembrance of the death of Christ and was very near to God,—all this they inherited from pious parents or teachers or from the devotional literature of the English Church. This attitude had remained in many English churchpeople when the doctrine which supported the devotion had been well nigh lost. The Tractarians brought back the doctrine. They taught that the bread and wine are made to be the body and blood of Christ by the consecration, and that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. By their doctrinal teaching they supplied a fuller justification for the devotion which had already existed, and they carried it further and gave it new forms. At first the doctrines of the real presence and the Eucharistic sacrifice were received and taught chiefly because the authority of Scripture and of the Church was seen to demand them. Other reasons for them—their congruity with the Incarnation, their harmony with the rest of Christian thought, their place in the sacramental system—were gradually realized. Fresh considerations—the spiritual character of our Lord's risen body and therefore of His body in the Eucharist, a wider conception of sacrifice as dedication which might involve death but did not necessarily require death or destruction, a fuller recognition of our Lord's heavenly priesthood—came in to support it. The holding of the belief led on to much in practice. Those who believed that the Eucharist is the sacrifice of Christ and that in it is

the sacramental presence of Christ wished to restore the Eucharist to the place from which it had been deposed, the central place in Christian worship. They aimed at surrounding it with all possible adjuncts of dignity. Those who believed that the communicant receives the very body of Christ Himself desired that the reception should be, as the Church from its early days had taught, the first food in the day. They recognized that the communicant must come to the holy gift with a cleansed soul.

So, bit by bit, and stage by stage, the Mass came to have the place which it now holds, and to be given the surroundings which it now possesses, in Anglo-Catholic churches. There has been the logical and practical development which is the natural result of the Tractarian belief.

The main features of the Eucharistic doctrine taught by the Tractarians are the common inheritance of Anglo-Catholics. There cannot be surprise that on so mysterious a subject there have been some differences among Anglo-Catholics, as there were among the Tractarians themselves. One such difference may be seen in the attitude towards the word Transubstantiation. The technical doctrine described by the word Transubstantiation was developed by the Western Schoolmen of the middle ages in their attempt at the same time to preserve the doctrine that the consecrated sacrament is the body and blood of Christ, to keep this doctrine free from a carnal view of our Lord's presence, and to make Eucharistic belief harmonious with the philosophy of their day. There was much to support, and much which was contrary to, this doctrine in the writings of the fathers; but it was rather as a result of logical reasoning than in conse-

quence of authority that the Schoolmen systematized it. In this work the aim of the Schoolmen—to guard tradition, to maintain valuable belief, to avoid carnal views, to reconcile theology and philosophy—was good, and for the time their attempt had much success. But changes in current philosophy have affected the value of their work, and the explanations which were intended to support Eucharistic doctrine have proved a hindrance rather than a help. The chief point affirmed in Transubstantiation, namely, that the substances—that is, the essential being—of bread and wine are so converted into the body and blood of Christ that in the consecrated sacrament these substances of bread and wine no longer exist, had been declared in earlier official utterances and was made a matter of faith for Roman Catholics by the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century. A similar doctrine was accepted by the Greek Church at the Council of Bethlehem in 1672 and with certain modifications intended to avoid Western technicalities by the Russian Church in 1838. Among Anglo-Catholics there are some for whom Transubstantiation has its attractions, while to others it appears to attach insufficient importance to the outward part of the sacrament and to embarrass theology by dependence on a particular philosophy not now usually held. There is no reason that some difference of opinion on this point should cause division. What is theologically and devotionally important is the positive truth that the consecrated sacrament is the body and blood of Christ, not whether the substances or essential being of bread and wine do or do not remain after the consecration. Hardly any, if any, theologians at the present time hold a theory of Transubstantiation to which serious religious objection

can be made. To the present writer there are reasons which appear to him weighty against the acceptance of the word or the doctrine of Transubstantiation, but the reasons are historical and philosophical rather than theological or religious.

Differences, again, may be found among Anglo-Catholics in regard to some aspects of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Some desire to concentrate their attention on the upper room and the cross ; to others the union with our Lord's offering of Himself in heaven is even more than the commemoration of His passion and death. There are differences, moreover, whether most prominence is to be given to the thought that the consecration is effected by the priest acting in the name of Christ and as the representative of the Church or to the belief that in response to the prayer of the priest and the Church the consecration takes place by the operation of the Holy Ghost. Questions such as these need not divide those who concur in holding the great positive truths which are so full of meaning that different ways of explaining them supplement and do not contradict one another, and however fully expressed fail to be exhaustive.

The development of the ceremonial which surrounds the Mass has passed beyond anything of which the earliest Tractarians dreamed. If one can imagine some of them present to-day at the High Mass in a church where the ceremonial is the most elaborate and ornate, one may suppose that the impressions made would not be by any means the same for all. For all indeed there might be at first such astonishment and perplexity as may be felt by an Eastern Christian with no knowledge of the West if he is present at a Low Mass in a Roman Catholic or English

church, or by a Western hitherto unaccustomed to the East if he sees the gorgeous pomp of the Eastern Liturgy. For some the perplexity might long remain. For others there might be the sense that here was the true outcome of what they believed, here was what they desired to see widely spread. For others the feeling might rather be a longing for a severe simplicity, an austerity, a quietness which they failed to find in a worship of outward splendour. The imagination of such impressions, if the earliest Tractarians could visit some of our churches to-day, may serve to illustrate a truth. There are certain principles of order, certain methods of worship, certain fixity of ceremonial, which Anglo-Catholics wish all who agree with them systematically and punctiliously to adopt. These make an atmosphere and suggest truths which they believe to be Catholic, and at once aid the acceptance of right belief and promote real devotion. But it cannot in the least be wished that elaboration of worship should be to the same extent in every church. What is fitting in one church may be most unsuitable in another. The principles of ceremonial should receive embodiment sometimes in the simplest, sometimes in the most ornate, fashion.

There has been discussion—the importance of which has often been exaggerated—as to the sources from which some details of ceremonial should be derived. In the earliest days of the restoration of ceremonial it was natural that the use of colours and other surroundings of worship should be based on the existing customs of the Roman Catholic Church. In the directions of the Roman Missal and in the practice of European churches there was a model ready to hand which could easily be followed. Later, there were

some who felt that the methods of the pre-Reformation English Church were in themselves better and had a stronger claim on English churchpeople than those of the present Roman Catholic Church. Later again, a plea was made that loyalty to the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer required a form of ceremonial which has been described as the "English Use." What is chiefly to be regretted about these divergencies is that they have tended to make divisions among friends, and to that extent have done harm. The sympathies of the present writer are all with the adoption of the colours and methods of ceremonial which are characteristic of the Roman Catholic Church of to-day. These colours and methods—which are the outcome of long experience—seem to him simpler and more practical and more instructive than those dictated by the other systems; and he values more than he can easily express anything, which can rightly be adopted in the Church of England, which may lessen differences from and promote similarities to the Church of Rome. But the different methods may well go on side by side at any rate for a time; and the whole question is one which calls for reasonable and considerate judgement and a tolerant spirit and a frank recognition that divergencies of this kind ought not to cause the smallest bitterness of temper or the slightest division.

One effect of the teaching and ceremonial which have resulted from the Oxford Movement has been a great increase in frequency of Communion. The weekly Communions which the Tractarians valued have become the practice of a greatly increased number; and many devout persons receive the Holy Communion on several days of the week, or daily. Side by side with this, priests have been led to desire more frequently

to exercise their office in saying Mass, and many make a practice of celebrating every day. There are dangers, of course, if frequency either of Communion or of celebrating should lead to carelessness or formality, or if the wish to say Mass should lead a priest to abstain from Communion if on any occasion he has not the opportunity of celebrating. Such dangers must accompany all great privileges. But the increased frequency itself is a subject for profound thankfulness. For the true life of a Christian is a Eucharistic life, in which through the reception of the sacrament he holds continuous communion with our Lord; and, though the continuity might remain unbroken if for long periods of time he were necessarily separated from sacramental Communion, it is best maintained by frequent receiving of the sacrament itself.

The doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice carries with it that the Mass is not only for Communion. It may be pleaded as an offering even by those who at the time of a particular offering are not making their Communion. Consequently, both at Low Mass and at High Mass, both on weekdays and on Sundays, the sacrifice is offered by those who do not then communicate. If they are regular and faithful communicants, they offer in the power of their membership in Christ strengthened and enkindled by their continuous communion with our Lord. If they make their Communion at times but are irregular or careless, they still have such continuity of sacramental life as their irregularity or carelessness has left to them. If they are baptized but not yet communicants, they can use the membership in Christ afforded by their Baptism. If they have lapsed from Communion, they may make the most of such Eucharistic life as remains. The liberality

of the Church opens wide its doors in the hope that, imperfect as the offering of some may be, all will attain so far as for the moment they can, and none will be hindered in depth and height of devotion because there are others whose prayers are less complete.

In the great sacrifice the Church offers the body and blood of our Lord. The offering of His body and blood is the pleading of His whole human life. His conception by His virgin mother, His life as a child living but not yet born, His birth and infancy and childhood and youth and manhood, His ministry and passion and death, the stay of His body in the tomb and of His soul in the unseen world, His resurrection, His sojourning on earth in His risen life, His ascension and session at the right hand of the Father on high,—all these have their place in the prayers with which the pleading is made. And this majestic sacrifice is offered for the manifold needs of mankind. It is offered for saints and for sinners, for the faithful and the tempted and the backsliding and the apostate, for the work of the Church all over the world, for nations and statesmen and kings and subjects, for societies and individuals, for the needs of capital and of labour, for family and household and friends, for the living and the dead. In it joy and sorrow, toil and conflict and rest, health and sickness and death, are gathered up into the one offering of Christ. The priest at the altar, and the people of God in the congregation, make the truth of the familiar words their own: "Mindful of Thy venerable passion I approach Thine altar, sinner though I be, to offer to Thee the sacrifice which Thou hast instituted and commanded to be offered in commemoration of Thee for our salvation. Receive it, I pray, O God most high, for Thy

holy Church, and for the people whom Thou hast purchased with Thy blood. . . . I offer, O Lord, if Thou wilt deign mercifully to behold, the trials of the poor, the perils of nations, the groans of prisoners, the sadness of orphans, the needs of travellers, the want of the weak, the disheartenment of the sick, the failing of the old, the aspirations of the young, the vows of virgins, the sorrows of widows."

CHAPTER VIII

THE RESERVED SACRAMENT

THE thought of reserving the holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ does not appear to have occurred to the Tractarians in the earliest days of the Movement. It would inevitably be suggested as soon as the study of the ancient and mediæval Church, of the Non-jurors, and of contemporary Catholicism outside the Church of England, had made much progress, and when practical questions concerning the giving of Communion were being faced. But the actual practice of reservation was not, so far as is known, begun for some time; and it was long before it became prominent or wide-spread. If the beginning of the Oxford Movement is placed in the year 1833, the earliest instance of reservation of which the present writer has been able to hear was more than twenty years after the beginning, and for many years later reservation probably was rare and to some extent secret.

The evidence about the administration of Holy Communion in the early Church to those present at the celebration and to those absent from it is scanty. But it is clear that provision was made for the absent. The account of Church rites given by St. Justin Martyr, writing at Rome in the middle of the second century, records that the consecrated sacrament was carried

to those who were not present at the service. Later writers show that in the third and fourth centuries the sick and others could receive the Holy Communion from the sacrament which was reserved, sometimes in private houses, sometimes in the priest's house, sometimes in the church. There are occasional instances in the first five centuries, each of them for some special reason, of Communion being given by means of celebration in a place other than the appointed place of worship; but the normal method of giving Communion to the sick and absent was by means of the reserved sacrament.

The custom of reservation continued through the later patristic period and through the middle ages both in the East and in the West. It was recognized as being part of the ordinary provision for the administration of the sacraments which the parish priest in the performance of his habitual duty was bound to make.

The course of events in the sixteenth and later centuries led to the custom in the Church of England being the opposite to that which had been usual in the early Church. In the early Church the sick and others were usually communicated from the sacrament which had been consecrated in the place of worship, and only in occasional instances from the sacrament consecrated in a private house. In the Church of England after the middle of the sixteenth century, the most usual, and then for a time the almost invariable, method of giving Communion to the sick was by means of a celebration in a private house. The Prayer Book of 1549 and the Latin Prayer Book of 1560 made provision for the sick being communicated either by the sacrament carried from the church or by means of a celebration

in the sick person's house; but the Prayer Books of 1552, 1558, 1604, and 1661 made mention only of the celebration in the sick person's house; and the methods of carrying the sacrament from the celebration in church and of reserving the sacrament, though not prohibited, fell into disuse. The disuse of reservation would be encouraged by the language of the twenty-eighth of the Articles of Religion, which, though carefully worded so as not actually to condemn reservation, stated that "the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved," that is, reservation was not part of what Christ Himself had commanded at the institution of the sacrament. And the rubric inserted in 1661 with the object of preventing the abuse of the consecrated sacrament being treated as ordinary bread and wine—"if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church, but the priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same"—possibly helped to confirm the disuse of reservation. It is obvious that this was not the intention of those who inserted the rubric. The context in the rubric and a statement by Bishop Cosin[1] show clearly that the object was to prevent profanation; the practice of reservation was not in view at the time; and the phraseology of the rubric was based on language from a canon which had been in operation when reservation was the recognized and universal custom of the Church.[2] Still, when the

[1] See *Cosin's Works* in *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, V, 519.

[2] *Decret.* 3 (de consecr.). dist. 2. cap. 23, "Quod si remanserint in crastinum non reserventur sed cum timore et tremore clericorum diligentia consumantur." Cf. Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, 3, 26, "Presbyter semper habebit Eucharistiam paratam propter infirmantes:

purpose of the rubric had been forgotten, it was not unnatural that those who did not know the history of the phraseology used in it should understand it as inconsistent with reservation.

Thus, when the insistence by the Tractarians on the doctrine about the Eucharist which they taught, and their emphasis on the value of Communion, had begun to tell, practical questions which had long slept were stirred. The current practice of the English Church, with its serious departure from the methods both of the ancient and of the mediæval Church, did not help those who were desirous of giving effect to the consequences of the Tractarian teaching. They were faced by a position not without complications. On the one hand there was much to encourage those who wished to restore reservation. There was their strong sense of the needs which might thereby be met. There were the natural inferences to be drawn from the immemorial duty of the priest to provide the reserved sacrament, a duty which appeared to be inherent in the charge of souls, and not to have depended on any privilege granted by a bishop or a council. There was the recognition of this duty in canons—some of them English—which had never been repealed. There was the absence of any prohibition of reservation in the formularies of the Church of England. And there was the inherited custom of reservation in the Scottish

de conse. di. 2 *c. Presbyter.* Nec obstat *eo d. c. tribus* ubi prohibetur hostias plures in altari dimissas reservare quia verum est quod non debent reservari ad opus consecrantium sed ad opus morientium sic ut ibi *no. per fo.* See also *Notes and collections on the Book of Common Prayer*, series 1 (wrongly assigned to Cosin), in *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Cosin's Works*, V, 121; T. W. Perry, *Some Historical Considerations relating to the Declaration on Kneeling* (1863), pp. 122, 123; C. Atchley (1899) quoted in *Hierurgia Anglicana* (new edition, 1903), ii, 164, 165; W. H. Frere, *A new history of the Book of Common Prayer* (1901), p. 502, note 1.

Church. On the other hand, there was the long disuse of the practice in the English Church, and a widespread, if somewhat vague, opinion that it was unlawful.

Some seventy years ago individual priests began to reserve the Blessed Sacrament; and by a progress at first slow and of late greatly accelerated the practice of reservation has increased until at the present time the number of churches in which it has been adopted is very great. It will be convenient to set out plainly the reasons because of which Anglo-Catholics reserve the Blessed Sacrament and value such reservation.

The primary purpose for which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved is to promote Communion. Experience has shown the importance of the sacrament being always at hand for the Communion of the sick and the dying. There are sudden emergencies in which the Communion of the dying is difficult or impossible if the reserved sacrament is not accessible. In many cases the administration of Communion from the reserved sacrament with a short service of prayer is more suitable for sick persons than the physically trying celebration, and is greatly preferred by many of them. In a large parish, the sick can be given more frequent Communion, and a larger number of sick persons can be communicated at the time of the great festivals, if there is reservation. The practical advantages of using the reserved sacrament for the sick and dying are very great.

There are many both in country and in town parishes for whom access to the church at the ordinary times of celebrations is very difficult. Both in town and in country there are classes of persons who have never been communicants, or have ceased to be so, not because of any hostility to religion or any disbelief

in the sacrament, but because the exigencies of their occupations hinder or prevent their attendance at the celebration in church. There is a limit everywhere to the extent to which the number of celebrations can be multiplied, and in parishes where there is only one priest this limit is very soon reached. This difficulty, which is felt acutely by many parochial clergymen, may be solved if at convenient hours Communion can be given in the church from the reserved sacrament to those who cannot come at the times of the celebrations.

Moreover, if the priest is able on fitting occasions to administer from the reserved sacrament to the communicants during the celebration the relief from some practical difficulties is great, and the doctrinal and devotional value of thus linking on one celebration with another is not small.

The gain for promoting Communion which is supplied by reservation amply justifies the long and primitive tradition of the Church in reserving the sacrament.

The importance of the Blessed Sacrament being constantly reserved in the church does not end with Communion. Experience has shown that, where there is reservation, churches are far more used for private prayer. Both in the Church of Rome and in the Church of England the reserved sacrament makes a centre for meditation, for intercession, for prayer of many kinds ; it supplies, more satisfactorily and more adequately, the need which has been met in a different way by the ikons in the East.

Some kind of common devotion in connexion with the reserved sacrament has been added to the private prayers of individuals in many English churches. For this addition there has been precedent in customs

which have long been used in the Western Church. Processions of the Host existed in England in the eleventh century, and continued to be part of the recognized worship of the Church. Exposition and Benediction—the placing of the sacrament outside the tabernacle and the blessing of the people by the priest making the sign of the cross with the sacrament—began about the fifteenth century[1] and became more usual in the Church of Rome after the Counter-Reformation in the sixteenth. In the English revival which resulted from the Tractarian Movement there have been occasional instances of Benediction and Exposition and of Processions of the Host since about the year 1855 ; and at the present time there are a few churches in which these are found. Of late years what have come to be known as " Devotions "—a form of service in which the reserved sacrament is a centre for worship but in which there is no actual Exposition or Benediction —have been largely used, and have been found to be both of much attractiveness and of real spiritual help.

In all that relates to worship surrounding the reserved sacrament the Anglo-Catholics of to-day have gone far beyond anything that was usual among the Trac-

[1] References to Exposition in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are frequent. As to Benediction, the present writer said in his *The Reserved Sacrament* (1917), pp. 73-75, that as a formal ceremony it probably is not older than the second half of the sixteenth century. After the publication of that book, however, Father H. Thurston in *The Month* for September, 1918, pp. 219-221, called attention to a probable allusion in the record of the Council held at London in 1309, and to a clear reference by Felix Hemerli, who died about 1460, in his treatise *de benedictionibus auræ cum sacramento faciendis* (see *variæ oblectationis opuscula*, 1497, signature r 2 verso, r 3 recto). Hemerli refers to Benediction incidentally as an illustration of his argument as if it was well known and recognized in Germany and Switzerland. That it was not practised till the sixteenth century in France has been thought to be shown by J. B. Thiers, *Traité de l'exposition du saint sacrement* (1679).

tarians. The austerity, the self-suppression, the dislike of any external show, the fear of outward attractions, which were among the most characteristic features of the Tractarians, were in a different direction from much in the worship which of late has surrounded the reserved sacrament, as indeed they were contrary to many other elements of worship in the Church of England to-day. The Church of England as a whole has departed much from the love of retirement, the desire for silence, the seeking to be unknown, the hatred of advertisement, which the Tractarians cherished. In all this there is loss as well as gain, but also gain as well as loss; and it inevitably affects methods of worship. In considering the relation of the Anglo-Catholics of the twentieth century to the Tractarians of the middle of the nineteenth century, the important question is not about methods but about principles.

There were temporary differences among some of the Tractarians on the subject of Eucharistic adoration. All ultimately realized that the doctrine of our Lord's presence in the consecrated sacrament requires that in the sacrament He is to be adored. The implications of this truth cannot in the long run be limited to the time of the celebration. The notion that the sacramental presence of our Lord remains during the actual time of the celebration but ceases if the sacrament is reserved after the celebration has no support from authority or reason, and cannot make a lasting appeal. The doctrine of the real presence, as Dr. Pusey and Mr. Keble taught it, leads on inevitably to the belief that, if the sacrament is reserved, our Lord is still there with His sacramental presence, and still is to be adored. To say *Adoro te devote* to our

Lord at the consecration in the Mass, and to say the same words to Him when kneeling before the reserved sacrament, is in principle the same act of devotion.

No distinction can rightly be made between private and public prayer in regard to what is lawful in principle. There may be distinctions as to what is expedient. Considerations of expediency may govern a good deal in the details of worship. But no such consideration can affect the truth that, if it is right for one person individually to worship our Lord in the reserved sacrament, it is also right for a number of persons to do so together; and, if it is right for one person or more persons than one so to worship our Lord in silence, it is also right for them so to worship Him with prayers and hymns in common and aloud. Whatever considerations of various kinds may dictate as to details of worship, the adoration of our Lord in the reserved sacrament by congregations follows from the adoration of Him at the time of Mass.

It is the belief of Anglo-Catholics that, in accordance with the tradition of the Catholic Church, it is the duty of the parish priest to reserve the sacrament in his parish church. They have no wish that this traditional duty should be imposed on those who do not agree with them. Rather, they would deprecate reservation by those whose beliefs would not justify them in reserving, or in surrounding the reserved sacrament with those outward signs of reverence and devotion which are its due. But history shows that the parish priest may fulfil this duty on his own initiative without seeking the leave of his bishop.

There are many matters in regard to the reserved sacrament about which the control of the bishop may be exercised. Formal services in connexion with it,

like all other services not contained in the Book of Common Prayer, are subject to episcopal control, though the moral appeal of this control is greatly lessened by two facts,—first, the rarity of bishops seeking the advice of their diocesan synods before making decisions, and, secondly, the toleration of a state of affairs in which there probably is no church in England where the Prayer Book is exactly and completely obeyed. The duty of the parish priest to reserve in his parish church does not confer on him or on others a right to reserve in private chapels, reservation in which, as a special privilege distinct from the ordinary provision for the faithful, needs the leave of the bishop.

The theological justification for the devotional use of the reserved sacrament does not stand alone. This devotional use has been found in practice to be a means of deepening the spiritual life, and strengthening the spiritual energies, of faithful souls. To such it has supplied joy and comfort and resolution. And not seldom it has helped those to whom religion was strange to find their way into a right use of the ministrations of the Church.

It has sometimes been maintained that the devotional use of the reserved sacrament diverts the attention of the soul from the worship of God in heaven, and lessens the power of the continuous communion of the soul with our Lord in the inner life. This objection is of so serious a character that the two parts of it call for separate and careful consideration.

It is objected, then, that by worshipping our Lord in the reserved sacrament the capacity of the soul for the worship of God in heaven is made less. Such an objection really ignores the place both of the Incarna-

tion and of the sacraments in Christian life. It is indeed true that God is everywhere, and that man can speak to Him and worship Him everywhere. There is an approach to God which can be made by heathen or Moslem or Jew or Christian independently of place or outward circumstance. In this approach there may be the true spirit of prayer and worship, and no one may doubt its value. It is the foundation in natural religion on which revealed religion may build. The Incarnation made possible a new approach whereby man with added security and fresh enlightenment and greater power might draw near to God in response as God drew near to him. The sacraments united Christians individually and corporately with God through the human nature of our Lord by a union more intimate and powerful than any approach to God had hitherto been. But neither Incarnation nor sacraments destroyed or lessened the communion of the soul with God which had been before them. Rather, they enhanced it and gave it new force. All that had been without them remained, but remained with a value essentially increased. Not otherwise, the worship of our Lord in the reserved sacrament does not take away the capacity for communion with Him and the Father and the Holy Ghost at other times. The Christian leaves the church where he has been worshipping our Lord in the reserved sacrament, and he carries with him into the world an increased power of realizing everywhere and always the presence of God.

In sacramental Communion the Christian receives the body and blood—the human life now spiritual and glorious—of our Lord. This gift bestows abiding union with our Lord on the soul. The communicant

treasures that union as his constant support and joy. It sustains him in many times of temptation and trial and pain. It is a strength which lasts. There is no inconsistency if the communicant from time to time seeks the presence of the Lord where the sacrament is reserved. As Communion itself deepens and strengthens the communing with God which may be without it, so the visit to our Lord in the reserved sacrament renews and freshens the sense of the inner union which Communion has bestowed as a lasting gift.

There is a great progress of spiritual life. At no one stage does the worshipper of God deny his past. All that is of value before the Incarnation or outside Christianity is preserved by the Christian with the new life which the Christian religion supplies. The sacramental union vitalizes all the good which there might be without it. The worship of our Lord in the reserved sacrament strengthens our hold on His presence within our souls, and it gives new reality to our recognition of the presence and work of God throughout the created world.

CHAPTER IX

CONFESSION

THE most marked characteristic of the Tractarians is their sense of the awful nature of sin. Their thought was coloured by the recognition of sin as a dire offence against the majesty of God, and as having deeply affected human life. The horror of it was to be estimated not only by its terrible results in human character and the fearful penalties which sinners might incur, but also and chiefly by the cost of forgiveness in the sufferings and death of our Lord. For the Christian, indeed, the redemption accomplished by Christ was brought home individually by means of Baptism ; in Baptism sin was pardoned ; in Baptism was newness of life. But after Baptism there might be, and as a normal experience there actually is, further sin. And the sin after Baptism has a new enormity, because it is against grace which has been received.

The consideration of sin gave the gloomy aspect which is seen in much of the earlier Tractarian teaching. The need of comfort was strongly felt. One part of the comfort was found in the Holy Eucharist. Another part was in the use of Confession.

The restoration of Confession was due to a concurrence of causes. The gravity of post-baptismal sin, the conviction that a forgiveness by sacramental

means should renew the life which the sacrament of Baptism had conveyed, the traditional use of Penance in the Church, and the provision of Confession and Absolution by the English Church in the Prayer Book, all pointed in the same direction. The Tractarians themselves had recourse to Confession; and they suggested it to their disciples.

The penitential system of the early Church, at first chiefly public, afterwards chiefly private, was partly a means of outward reconciliation and partly a means for applying the meritorious passion and death of our Lord to individual souls for the forgiveness of their sins. The purpose of this authority given to the Church by our Lord, was not primarily spiritual advice or the advance in goodness of those who were remaining faithful. The authority was used, as it had been instituted, for dealing with sin. To receive counsel, and to be helped in spiritual progress, confessions were made to monks and others independently of the penitential system. During the middle ages and in the Roman Catholic Church after the sixteenth century the hearing of confessions with a view to giving Absolution and the receiving of confidences with a view to giving advice were to a large extent combined; and the sacrament of Penance came to be used not only for its original purpose as a means of receiving forgiveness for grave sin but also as a method of making advance in goodness through the confession and absolution of all kinds of faults and through the advice of a spiritual counsellor.

The successive editions of the English Prayer Book continued to make provision for Confession, and occasional instances of the use of Confession long after the sixteenth century are known. Early in the

nineteenth century the probability is that it was hardly used at all, and that the references to it in the Prayer Book were, with very rare exceptions, ignored. In the Tractarian revival the primary object was, as in the ancient Church, to use a means for the forgiveness of post-baptismal sin, and a secondary object—the reception of counsel—was closely linked with it. A striking instance is afforded by the history of the first confession made by Dr. Pusey. The object with which the confession was made was to receive forgiveness, but he took with him a proposed rule of life in order that he might receive the advice of his confessor about it. And in his subsequent habitual use of Confession the two objects were still combined.

To enter an Anglo-Catholic church to-day is to observe the opportunities afforded for Confession. Notices may be seen announcing the frequent times at which priests are in church to hear confessions; there are confessional boxes or some similar arrangements for the hearing of confessions.

In some respects the Anglo-Catholic teaching about Confession is identical with that of the Tractarians. The object of Confession is that the forgiveness won by our Lord in His passion and death may be applied to the soul by the sacramental means which He appointed. Its rightful use and the fulfilment of the promise attached to it demand that the penitent has repentance and faith, and that it is his desire to fight against and overcome sin. Existing primarily for the forgiveness of grave sins, which have separated the soul from God and interrupted the due operation of the grace received in Baptism, it may be used as a means of bringing all kinds of less sins to God in penitence. Spiritual advice, though not the object of the

sacrament, may well be given in connexion with it. The use of Confession at some great crisis of spiritual history may lead to the habitual use of it as an ordinary part of the devotional life.

There are incidental differences between Tractarians and Anglo-Catholics which are in circumstances only. From the necessities of the case, the earlier practice had about it much privacy or even secrecy. Confessions were heard in churches when no one was likely to be in them and sometimes with locked doors, in vestries, in private houses. All this, however necessary for the time, certainly was unhealthy. The necessities for it have now passed. Indeed the large number of confessions now heard in many churches would render the continuance of it impossible. The administration of Penance has become as open as such a regular ordinance of the Church ought to be.

A more serious difference may be in the opinions held as to the obligation of sacramental confession. This obligation was regarded by the Tractarians as chiefly moral. As the real meaning and horror of sin were realized, and in particular as there was fuller understanding of it as an offence against the love of God, the soul that was truly penitent would desire to use all possible ways of humiliation, all possible means of deepening sorrow, every possible method of bringing the acknowledgment of sin to the cross of Christ. It was desirable that Church teaching should include full instruction on the subject ; the parish priest must tell his candidates for Confirmation and others of the provision which the Church had made ; it was simple honesty that he should speak to his people during their life time of the ordinance about which he was commanded by the Prayer Book to tell them when

seriously ill; it was but reverence for Almighty God that there should be in life what was to be done before death. But the using of Confession was regarded as permissive rather than as obligatory, as the act to which the soul was driven by the depth and sincerity of its penitence rather than as a compliance with any regulation of the Church. No thoughtful Anglo-Catholic would wish to lessen the moral aspect of Confession. But a question arises that is theological and historical. If the initial forgiveness of the Christian soul is bestowed by God in the sacrament of Baptism, and if mortal sin—that is, grave sin committed with knowledge and deliberation by an act of the will—separates from God and stops the beneficial influence of the baptismal grace, may it not be that a sacramental restoration of the state which was sacramentally conferred may be needed? And historically, is it not the case that for the gravest offences the Penance of the ancient Church—of which the sacrament of Penance is the descendant—was required? And, if so, may there not be an obligation binding instructed Catholics to seek sacramental Absolution by means of Confession when a mortal sin has been committed? And, if sacramental confession of all mortal sins be needed, and if it is often difficult for a sensitive soul to be sure whether a sin has been mortal or not, will not a practice of habitual Confession from early years be wise? This theological and historical consideration, more felt to-day than it was by the earlier Tractarians, probably leads many Anglo-Catholics to view the obligation of Confession in a somewhat different light, and to believe that this different light is required by the very principles which the Tractarians revived. And, so far as this is the case, they may teach about Confession

with an added emphasis on the need of it.

Many Confessions made to-day are those of steady faithful souls who are going quietly on in paths of holiness, some of whom, perhaps, have not committed a mortal sin in the whole course of their lives. The extent of this practice is far greater now than in the time of the Tractarians. But the difference is one of extent only. The Tractarians allowed and encouraged the making of such Confessions. There is no doubt that such a use of sacramental confession is an expansion of the original Penance of the Church. It is one of the effects of the union in the Church of the confession made for the purpose of receiving reconciliation after grave sin, and the seeking of spiritual counsel and help in another way. But that is not an objection to it. An expansion of the original use of the sacraments is one of the ways in which the authority of the Church is operative. The fact that in the earliest days all who were present at any celebration of the Eucharist, apart from some special reason, received the Communion at that time is not a reason against the lawfulness of attendance at Mass without Communion. The fact that the purpose of reserving the consecrated sacrament in the first instance was, and still is, that it may be received in Communion does not make services of Adoration unlawful. Similarly, the fact that the sacrament of Penance was instituted for the forgiveness of grave sin does not require that this wider use should be forbidden.

The practice of Confession has been misunderstood and attacked probably more than any other part of the Catholic system. Whether administered in the Church of Rome or in the Church of England, it is still regarded with deep distrust by very many English

people. No one need deny that there have been abuses connected with it. Some may have used it formally or mechanically or without serious purpose of amendment. Some may have allowed it to be a sop to conscience or a comfort which their spiritual state did not really warrant. But those who know most about it concur in saying that by means of it there have been conquests of sin which might otherwise have been impossible, a degree of progress in holiness which else could hardly have been, and that even those who have profited least by it would have done less well without it. There are many priests with a large experience in hearing Confessions who can echo the words which Dr. Pusey wrote seventy-five years ago: "If there is one part of our ministry which God has blessed; if there be one part of our office, as to the fruits of which we look with hopefulness and joy to the day of judgement, it is to the visible cleansing of souls, the deepened penitence, 'the repentance unto salvation not to be repented of,' the hope in Christ, the freshness of grace, the joy of forgiven souls, the evident growth in holiness, the angel-joy 'over each sinner that repenteth,' which this ministry has disclosed to us."[1] The present writer well remembers discussing the subject of Confession with an experienced priest some forty years ago, and the priest saying: "I cannot think of anyone who would not be better for it." Such estimates on the part of those who have knowledge afford the evidential justification of the system of Penance established in the Church.

[1] E. B. Pusey, *The Church of England leaves her children free to whom to open their griefs* (1850), p. 3.

CHAPTER X

UNCTION OF THE SICK

THE New Testament suggests different ways of dealing with disease. On ordinary occasions our Lord used ordinary natural means in His incarnate life, and sustained His human nature by food and sleep. He thus sanctioned and hallowed all natural means, the results of scientific inquiry, the experience of physicians, the skill of surgeons, that influence of mind on body which is a natural faculty. Our Lord taught also the power of prayer and the power of miracle, and spoke of these as to be exercised by His disciples. And in allowing His apostles to anoint the sick during His ministry He foreshadowed a sacramental use of oil. Prayer and miracle are ways of dealing with disease mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles; and in one Epistle there is a further advance towards a sacrament of Unction: "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the presbyters of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and, if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him."[1]

The four ways of dealing with disease suggested by the New Testament—natural means, prayer, miracle,

[1] St. James v, 14, 15.

sacrament—are all found in the records of the ancient Church. It is unnecessary here to dwell on the first three apart from saying that such instances as that of cures by the use of oil from the church lamp[1] are to be associated rather with miracle than with sacrament. More attention must be paid to the sacramental use of oil.

The evidence from the early Church for the Unction which became the Office of the Holy Oil in the East and the Last Anointing in the West is scanty and fragmentary, but there is sufficient to show that it was a rite of the Church. It is so referred to in the sequence of Church Orders, which show the existence of such a rite from the end of the second century to the end of the fourth century ;[2] and there are allusions to it in other literature from the fifth century onwards.[3]

In the earliest references to the Unction of the Sick it is difficult to distinguish sharply between the healing of the body and the healing of the soul. If the passage in the Epistle of St. James stood by itself, the present writer would be disposed to interpret it as referring to spiritual healing only, that is, only to the healing of the soul from sin. The whole context of the passage relates to what is spiritual ;[4] dealing with sin is closely associated with the particular command for anointing ;[5] the words " that ye may be healed " in the following

[1] St. Chrysostom speaks of this as if it was not infrequent : see his *in Matt. hom.* xxxii, 6.

[2] See the earliest form of the Roman Church Order in E. Hauler, *Fragmenta Veronensia Latina* (1900), pp. 110, 111 ; and the later forms in G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles* (1904), p. 141 ; *Canons of Hippolytus*, § 28 ; *Testament of the Lord*, i, 24, 25 ; Serapion, §§ 5, 17 ; *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii, 29.

[3] Pope Innocent I, *ep.* xxv, 8 (March 19, 416) ; Cæsarius of Arles (died 542), *serm.* cclxv. 3, cclxxix, 4, 5.

[4] See chapter v throughout.

[5] verse 15 : " if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him."

verse obviously denote healing from sin ;[1] the words "the Lord shall raise him up" might refer equally easily to healing of body or healing of soul ;[2] the usage of the New Testament elsewhere would support interpreting the words "the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick" rather of the soul than of the body.[3] The most obvious interpretation of the passage, then, would be to understand it only of the healing of the soul. In view, however, of the constant association of bodily healing with Unction in the prayers for blessing oil in the early forms of the Church Order and in the writings of the fathers, it is perhaps more likely that both healing of body and healing of soul are referred to in the Epistle than that the allusion is to healing of soul only. If such is the right interpretation, this will be in harmony with the close connexion of body and soul which is constantly assumed in the New Testament.

Healing of body is prominent in the earliest writings outside the New Testament which allude to Unction, and such healing may have been the primary purpose in the administration. But references to a gift of spiritual grace are not absent ; sanctification of soul and forgiveness of sins are mentioned ;[4] and it is

[1] verse 16.

[2] In the New Testament ἐγείρω usually refers to the body, but it has a spiritual significance in Rom. xiii, 11 ; Eph. v, 14.

[3] In a very large majority of passages in the New Testament σώζω refers to the soul.

[4] See the references on page 65, notes 2 and 3 above. I am unable to accept the learned and ingenious suggestions for the alteration of the text of Serapion and the later form of the Roman Church Order made by my friend Father F. W. Puller in his *The Anointing of the Sick in Scripture and Tradition* (1904), pp. 95-110. The phrase "forgiveness of sins" in the text above is from Cæsarius of Arles, *serm.* cclxv, 3, "corporis sanitatem accipere et peccatorum indulgentiam . . . obtinere;" cclxxix, 5, "non solum sanitatem corporum sed etiam remissionem acciperent peccatorum."

impossible wholly to distinguish the operations of God in response to the prayers of the Church for the body from those for the soul.

Little is known about the administration of this Unction in the Eastern Church during the middle ages. The probability is that the practice was much the same as in the ancient Church with a growing tendency to restrict it to the dying, and to lay greater stress on the effects in the soul than on those in the body. At the present time more is said about the soul than about the body throughout the office of administration, and both are mentioned side by side in the actual prayer of anointing; healing of both spiritual and bodily infirmities is mentioned in official documents and in the writings of theologians; the Unction is usually, though not exclusively, administered to persons seriously or dangerously ill; and in some places the consecrated oil is used on Maundy Thursday as a preparation for the reception of the Holy Communion by those who are well.

In the West it is probable that the tendency during the middle ages was to restrict the administration to the dying, and to emphasize the spiritual rather than the bodily effects. By the twelfth century it had become chiefly a sacrament for the dying, and a little later the title "extrema unctio," which originally meant the last of the anointings in distinction from the anointings in other sacraments, had come to mean also the anointing of those at the point of death. Among the causes which led to the administration being restricted to the dying may have been the superstition that it might not be received a second time, and that one who had been so anointed might not afterwards eat flesh or walk with bare feet or

use marriage, charges made by priests for the administration of the sacrament, and the teaching of some theologians that this Unction so completely frees the soul from evil and confers on it God's gifts that it prepares the soul for the immediate entrance into glory. But, while the chief emphasis was on the spiritual effects, the healing of the body was not wholly ignored. In the modern Roman Catholic Church the sacrament is administered to persons dangerously ill, usually when they are near death, though books of instruction for priests say that they should try to secure administration earlier than just at the last. The effects are said to be the strengthening of the soul against the pains of death, the preparing of the soul for entrance into glory, forgiveness of sin and removal of the effects of sin, and, if such be the will of God, the restoration of, or improvement in, bodily health.

Anointing was retained as part of the Order for the Visitation of the Sick in the English Prayer Book of 1549, with the instruction: "If the sick person desire to be anointed, then shall the priest anoint him upon the forehead or breast only"; and the objects prayed for were both bodily and spiritual health. The provision for anointing was omitted in the 1552 and subsequent English Prayer Books. Anointing was restored by the section of the Non-jurors known as the Usagers.

No vigorous attempt to recover the Unction of the Sick was made by the Tractarians. Writing in 1867 Bishop Alexander Forbes described it as "the lost pleiad of the Anglican firmament." A desire for the general restoration of it was implied by the same writer, and he expressed his conviction that there was "nothing to hinder the apostolic and scriptural custom

of anointing the sick, whensoever any devout person may desire it."[1]

The number of instances in which the Unction of the Sick has been administered in the Church of England during the last fifty years probably is large, though the private nature of the administration makes any accurate estimate impossible. Anglo-Catholics in general desire its more complete restoration.

In this desire for the more complete restoration of the Unction of the Sick there are different motives. The opinion of many is that the ordinary practice of the Roman Catholic Church embodies the experience gained in the Church's life, and is the best method for the use of the sacrament. Others hold that the right idea of the Unction has long been perverted or obscured, and that the purpose of the administration should be, at any rate primarily, the restoration or amelioration of bodily health. Others, again, believe that the two objects cannot be divided, and that neither an administration in which the recovery of bodily health is the primary object nor a use as a sacrament of the dying is to be condemned.

Methods of spiritual healing of bodily disease, in which sometimes anointing with oil and sometimes the laying on of hands is used, have of late been advocated and adopted by many whose theological and ecclesiastical position is very far distant from that of Anglo-Catholics. The popularity of these methods —and in some cases their apparent efficacy—may serve to illustrate that, whatever abuses there may have been in the early sixteenth century, the abandonment of the Unction of the Sick by the official English

[1] Bishop A. P. Forbes, *An Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles* (third edition, 1878), pp. 465, 474.

Church was the result of a failure to appreciate real needs. Moreover, " the Church of England," to quote Bishop Forbes again, " acted more in conformity to its declared adherence to antiquity by appointing, in the first instance, a service for the anointing of the sick in her first English Prayer Book "[1] than by the later omission of any such provision.

[1] Bishop A. P. Forbes, *op. cit.*, p. 474.

CHAPTER XI

HOLY ORDERS

THE need of the English Church in regard to the ministry, when the Tractarian Movement began, was not the restoration of something which had been lost but the due appreciation of what had been retained. For the Church of England had securely kept the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons by a continuous succession, which the tumults and changes of the sixteenth century and the disasters of the seventeenth had not been able to break. But by the beginning of the nineteenth century there were few who had retained a Catholic belief as to what these three Orders meant. The impoverished ideas about the Holy Eucharist, the practical disuse of Confession, the forgetfulness of the sacramental principle in general, had combined to obscure a true conception of the ministry. So, when the first of the *Tracts for the Times*, dated September 9, 1833, appeared, there were phrases used which had a strange, and even a startling, sound. The description in the dedication of "the presbyters and deacons of the Church of Christ in England, ordained thereunto by the Holy Ghost and the imposition of hands," though it said no more than the Prayer Book itself, struck an unfamiliar note in the emphasis on Ordination being "by the Holy Ghost." In the *Tract* itself, the

Church was described as "our Holy Mother," the bishops were "the successors of the apostles," "the real ground on which our authority is built" was "our apostolical descent," "the doctrine of the apostolical succession" expressed "a plain historical fact," there was an exhortation: "Exalt our Holy Fathers the bishops, as the representatives of the Apostles, and the Angels of the Churches; and magnify your office, as being ordained by them to take part in their Ministry." Such language showed the conception of the Ministry which was to mark the Tractarian Movement; and, when the first forty-six *Tracts* were collected into a volume about a year later, "the apostolic succession" and "the Holy Catholic Church" were mentioned in the prefixed "advertisement" as the "principles of action" which the writers of the *Tracts* desired to emphasize.

The doctrine of the apostolic succession was central in the Tractarian teaching about the Ministry. The bishops are the successors of the apostles because one bishop has succeeded another in occupying their sees, because a continuous commission has been received by one bishop after another, because the bishops perform the functions which in the earliest Christian Church were performed by the apostles, and because the grace of the episcopate has been permanently preserved by the transmission of the divine gifts through episcopal consecration from the time of the apostles to the present day.[1] In the ancient Church a bishop

[1] It has been maintained, notably by the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. A. C. Headlam), that the true idea of apostolic succession, which was held in the early Church, did not include this fourth point. See the Bishop's article entitled "Apostolic Succession" in *The Prayer Book Dictionary* (second edition, 1925), pp. 34-39, his *Bampton Lectures* on *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion* (1920), pp. 128, 172, 265, and his *Charge* entitled *The Church of*

was regarded as succeeding the apostles partly because he inherited the see which he occupied, and partly because he was consecrated to his office by another bishop. There was succession by office, and there was succession by consecration. It followed from the doctrine, as taught by the Tractarians, that a valid consecration of a bishop or a valid ordination of a priest depended on the consecrator or ordainer having received the grace of episcopacy through a succession from the apostles. They rightly understood the traditional teaching in the Church to require that a bishop must succeed to the apostles not only by holding an episcopal office but also by having received episcopal consecration.

Bishops and priests, then, in the eyes of the Tractarians, were not only holders of certain positions in the Church. They were also possessors of very awful spiritual powers, for the possession of which there was no guarantee outside the Catholic Church, by which a bishop could consecrate the holy mysteries, absolve, confirm, ordain, and by which a priest could absolve and consecrate.

In the Tractarian theology the bishop and the priest were regarded as acting in the name of Christ and as His representatives. To this was added by many who accepted the Tractarian teaching a further conception that the bishop or the priest acts on behalf of the Church and as the representative of the Church. The great action of the Holy Eucharist, for instance, is the work of the Church as a whole. The plural number

England (1924), pp. 121-124. For ancient evidence about the succession see the paper *Who are members of the Church?* (1921) by Father F. W. Puller and the present writer, Appendix III, pp. 64-72; and Father F. W. Puller, *Essays and Letters on Orders and Jurisdiction* (1925), pp. 1-57.

used in the traditional rites of the Church in such phrases as " We offer to Thy glorious Majesty " is an illustration of this aspect of the act. A priest cannot be ordained without a bishop, and the Holy Eucharist cannot be consecrated without a priest, any more than a man can see without an eye, but the ordination and the consecration are the acts of the whole Church, as sight is the act of the whole man. These two aspects—that of the bishop and priest acting in the name of Christ, and that of their acting in the name of the Church—are not contradictory but supplementary. Inheriting the Tractarian teaching, many Anglo-Catholics have combined with it this further aspect. The chief stress is laid by some of them on the action being in the name of Christ, by others on the action being in the name of the Church. To some the first idea makes the strongest appeal, to others the second is more attractive. Each has its own points of contact with Catholic theology. Great divines have emphasized the one or the other.[1] Anglo-Catholics may well be content to hold them in combination.

Since the time of the Tractarians there has been much progress in the study of early Church History. Few scholars would now deny that there are obscure and difficult problems in the first and second centuries. But, the more complete the study, the more it has made clear that all which is essential to the Tractarian theology about the ministry is well established.[2]

[1] For instance, St. Thomas Aquinas insists that the words of consecration in the Mass are said by the priest in the person of Christ, though he says also that the priest when offering the prayers of the Mass speaks in the person of the Church (see *e.g.*, *summa theologica*, III, LXXVIII, 1, LXXX, 12 ad 3, LXXXII, 1, 3, 4, 7 ad 3, LXXXIII, 1 ad 3); and it is an important part of the theology of Duns Scotus that the priest offers the sacrifice in the person of the whole Church (see *e.g.*, *quæstiones quodlibetales*, XX).

[2] See the volume entitled *Essays on the early history of the Church*

It is necessary to guard against two misconceptions. First, the assertion that divine gifts are transmitted by means of episcopal consecration and ordination does not imply any physical or material process. It does not imply that the consecrating or ordaining bishop is the source of grace. There is no idea of a physical or material thing which the bishop takes from himself and gives to another; and the source of grace is God. Secondly, the denial that there can be a valid ministry without an episcopal succession, or a valid Eucharist without an episcopally ordained priest, does not involve a denial that there are gifts of God to those who are without such a ministry and such sacraments. It may well be that God bestows gifts on those outside the Church who in good faith try to serve Him, or aim at what they see to be best. Much spiritual benefit may be received by the Wesleyan using what he believes to be true sacraments, or the member of the Society of Friends who rejects any sacrament, or the heathen to whom even the name of Christ is unknown. All these in their several ways may reach different degrees of righteous life and communion with God. One of the strictest of orthodox theologians used the phrase that the power of God " is not tied to the visible sacraments."[1] The existence of a visible Church, within which there is covenanted grace and the guarantee of valid sacraments, does not necessitate the denial that sanctifying gifts may be bestowed on those outside it by the Author of all good.

and the Ministry (1918, second edition, 1921), edited by H. B. Swete and C. H. Turner.

[1] St. Thomas Aquinas, *summa theologica*, III, LXVIII, 2.

CHAPTER XII

HOLY MATRIMONY

AT the beginning of the Tractarian Movement questions about marriage were far less prominent than they have since become. There was no doubt among Church people in general that divorce was not recognized in the Church of England. It was acknowledged that the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony did not contemplate the possibility of either husband or wife marrying again in the lifetime of the other. The prohibition in the canons of 1603, preventing one who had been separated from contracting matrimony while the other remained alive, was regarded as in accordance with the law of Christ. The Table of Prohibited Degrees printed at the end of the Prayer Book and sanctioned by canon 99 of 1603 was viewed as a summary of the teaching of Holy Scripture and as binding on Church people. The Divorce Act of 1857 and the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act of 1907 were still far off. The distinction by which before 1835 marriages contracted in disobedience to the Table of Prohibited Degrees, though voidable, were not necessarily void by the law of the State, and the allowance by the State of a divorce for which an Act of Parliament was obtained, were not sufficiently utilized to make practical difficulty frequent.

The general teaching of the early Tractarians did

something to emphasize the high regard in which marriage was held, and the spiritual importance of the marriage rite. A poem in *The Christian Year*, published in 1827, six years before the beginning of the Oxford Movement, laid stress on the personal action of our Lord in the administration of Matrimony :

> "'Tis He who clasps the marriage band,
> And fits the spousal ring,
> Then leaves ye kneeling, hand in hand,
> Out of His stores to bring
> His Father's dearest blessing."

But any distinct recognition of the sacramental character of Holy Matrimony came slowly.

When attempts were made to legalize by the sanction of the State marriage with a deceased wife's sister, these attempts were resisted by the Tractarians.[1] As the question of divorce became more prominent, there was some difference of opinion among them. Mr. Keble maintained the absolute indissolubility of valid Christian marriage ;[2] arguments used by Dr. Pusey tended towards the opinion that, while apart from one exception marriage is indissoluble, yet one exception exists, and that a husband may put away an adulterous wife and marry again.[3]

On these particular subjects Anglo-Catholics are not all agreed. All of them would unhesitatingly say that the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act of 1907

[1] See *e.g.*, E. B. Pusey, *Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister prohibited by Holy Scripture as understood by the Church for 1500 years* (1849).

[2] See his *An argument for not proceeding immediately to repeal the laws which treat the nuptial bond as indissoluble* (1857), and *Sequel of the argument against immediately repealing the laws which treat the nuptial bond as indissoluble* (1857).

[3] See his note to the translation of Tertullian in the *Library of the Fathers* (second edition, 1854), pp. 443-449.

has made no difference in the law of the Church, and that the prohibition which the Act removed still exists for Church people. They would unanimously repudiate a theory that the law of the Church can be altered by any action of the State. But, apart from this general agreement, there are differences of opinion. It is held by some that the prohibition of this particular marriage is so necessitated by the teaching of Holy Scripture and the law of the Church, and so bound up with the principle of affinity, that there can be no exceptions to it; and that the dispensations for it, which are given in certain cases by the Roman Catholic Church, in history resulted from a weak yielding to the pressure of great men, and are now due not to any sound principle but to moral compromise. On the other hand, there are those who hold that there is no absolute bar in principle to such marriages, and that for sufficient reasons they may well be allowed by special permission, as by the Roman Catholic dispensations.[1]

There is probably less difference of opinion among Anglo-Catholics in regard to the indissolubility of marriage. With very rare exceptions they hold that any valid and consummated marriage is absolutely indissoluble, and that the re-marriage of either husband or wife while the other lives is both unlawful and invalid. They therefore refuse to publish banns for, or officiate at, or lend their churches for, such ceremonies. Any other course would be intolerable to them, since they believe that the probibition of re-marriage after divorce in the Church of England is

[1] The present writer's agreement with the former of these opinions may be seen in his *The Law of Christian Marriage especially in relation to the Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act* (1907).

based on a right interpretation of Holy Scripture and of the tradition of the Church.[1]

The essence of marriage is in the contract of man and woman. In making this contract those who are being married ought, if they are Christians, to receive the blessing of the Church. They receive this blessing as they make their contract in church in the presence of a priest, and receive through him the divine ratification. A valid marriage of baptized persons places them in a sacramental relation, even if they do not receive the Church's blessing, and is indissoluble.[2]

It has already been said (page 28) that the number of the sacraments is largely a matter of terminology. It would be easy to formulate reasons for a number greater than seven or less. But tradition in the Church since the twelfth century, and the practice of the Eastern and Roman Catholic Churches at the present time, concur with obvious convenience and reasonableness in supporting a terminology which makes the number to be seven, and includes Holy Matrimony in the list. In His ministry our Lord showed His sanction for the institution of marriage, which already existed, and reaffirmed the sacred character of the marriage bond; as far back as evidence goes, Christian marriage has received the blessing of the Church; in it there are the inward grace which God gives and the outward part in the contract between man and wife. If, in an age of many dangers to married

[1] The writer believes that Anglo-Catholics in general agree with the main position taken up in his *Divorce and Re-marriage* (1913).

[2] This is the ordinary Western teaching, which the writer understands is accepted by Anglo-Catholics in general. The teaching of the Eastern Church makes the minister to be a bishop or priest. As a matter of discipline, the Roman Catholic Church, by a decree of the Council of Trent and a regulation of Pope Pius X, has required the presence of a priest and two witnesses at all marriages of Roman Catholics.

and family life, Anglo-Catholics do something to maintain the solemnity and sanctity of marriage itself, to preserve a due sense of its privileges and responsibilities, to help the married to fulfil their obligations to one another and to their families in the true Christian spirit, they will deserve well of society in general no less than of the Church.

The writer has quoted before in another book a passage as powerful as it is eloquent by a great Christian layman, who was an adherent of the Tractarians. It is not inappropriate to quote it here again: "Beyond all things else marriage derives its essential and specific character from restraint: restraint from the choice of more than a single wife; restraint from choosing her among near relatives by blood or affinity; restraint from the carnal use of woman in any relation inferior to marriage; restraint from forming any temporary or any other than a lifelong contract. By the prohibition of polygamy it concentrates the affections which its first tendency is to diffuse; by the prohibition of incest it secures the union of families as well as individuals, and keeps the scenes of dawning life and early intimacy free from the smallest taint of appetite; by the prohibition of concubinage it guards the dignity of woman and chastens whatever might be dangerous as a temptation in marriage through the weight of domestic cares and responsibilities; by the prohibition of divorce, above all, it makes the conjugal union not a mere indulgence of taste and provision for enjoyment, but a powerful instrument of discipline and self-subjugation, worthy to take rank in that subtle and wonderful system of appointed means by which the life of man on earth becomes his school for heaven."[1]

[1] W. E. Gladstone in *Quarterly Review*, July, 1857, pp. 285, 286, reprinted in *Gleanings of Past Years*, vi, 101, 102.

CHAPTER XIII

OUR LADY AND THE SAINTS

IN considering the thought of the Tractarians in regard to our Lady and the saints, it is worth while to compare *The Christian Year*, published in 1827, with the *Lyra Innocentium*, published in 1846. Among the matters in which Mr. Keble had reached greater definiteness in the *Lyra Innocentium* Dr. Lock in his biography has included the relation to the saints. It would be far from true to say that devotion to our Lady and the saints is absent from *The Christian Year*. Such an assertion would be refuted at once by the poems in which the lines occur:

"So on the King of Martyrs wait
Three chosen bands, in royal state,
And all earth owns, of good and great,
Is gathered in that choir."[1]

"His throne, thy bosom blest,
O Mother undefiled—
That throne, if aught beneath the skies,
Beseems the sinless child."[2]

"Ave Maria! Mother blest,
To whom, caressing and caressed,
Clings the Eternal Child;
Favoured beyond Archangels' dream,
When first on thee with tenderest gleam
Thy new-born Saviour smiled."[3]

[1] For St. Stephen's Day.
[2] For the Purification.
[3] For the Annunciation.

But in 1846 the language is more explicit and the influence of the thought is greater than in 1827. As Dr. Lock points out, " The saints have grown dearer to him, and he loves to trace in the baptized not only the signs of filial likeness to the Father which is in heaven, but of likeness to its brothers the saints, whether they recall the penitence of St. Peter, the loving smile of the loved disciple, or the purity of Blessed Mary. Especially is reverence towards the Blessed Virgin marked—her

> ' Whom the awful blessing
> Lifted above all Adam's race.'

The orphaned child is taught to feel that not only her own mother is praying for her, but also ' A holier mother rapt in more prevailing prayer.' "[1] Most significant of all is the poem entitled *Mother out of Sight* which had been written in 1844, and which Mr. Keble intended to prefix to the *Lyra Innocentium* in 1846 until dissuaded from doing so by some of his more nervous friends. At the beginning of the poem a boy is mentioned as going into a room, looking round it quickly, and going out in disappointment because " My mother is not here." This image represents the first thought in the poem that in the Church of England the holy Mother of our Lord is not found. But Mr. Keble speedily corrects it. The daily recital of the Magnificat is a continual commemoration. The observance of her five festivals marks her honour. For those who have eyes to see she is still here.

> " Fails He to bless or home or choral throng
> Where true hearts breathe His Mother's evensong ?

[1] W. Lock, *John Keble* (third edition, 1893), p. 136.

Mother of God! O, not in vain
We learned of old thy lowly strain.
Fain in thy shadow would we rest,
And kneel with thee, and call thee blest;
With thee would 'magnify the Lord,'
And, if thou art not here adored,
Yet seek we, day by day, the love and fear
Which bring thee, with all saints, near and more near.

. . . . . .

Thenceforth, whom thousand worlds adore,
He calls thee Mother evermore;
Angel nor Saint His face may see
Apart from what He took of thee.
How may we choose but name thy name
Echoing below their high acclaim
In holy Creeds? Since earthly song and prayer
Must keep faint time to the dread anthem there.

How but in love on thine own days,
Thou blissful one, upon thee gaze?"

And, moreover, those in the Church of England who are using what the Church of England thus provides may supplement it by further devotion.

"Nay every day, each suppliant hour,
Whene'er we kneel in aisle or bower,
Thy glories we may greet unblamed,
Nor shun the lay by seraphs framed,
'Hail, Mary, full of grace!' O, welcome sweet,
Which daily in all lands all saints repeat!

. . . . . .

Therefore as kneeling day by day
We to our Father duteous pray,
So unforbidden may we speak
An Ave to Christ's Mother meek:

(As children with 'good morrow' come
To elders in some happy home:)
Inviting so the saintly host above
With our unworthiness to pray in love." [1]

In regard to this matter, Mr. Keble may have been in advance of other Tractarians, especially in the suggestion that members of the Church of England may rightly join the Hail Mary to the Our Father in their prayers. But there were not wanting those who agreed with him.

A notable instance of growth in regard to the invocation of saints is supplied by John Henry Newman. In 1833 Mr. Newman published in the *British Magazine*, and in 1836 republished in the *Lyra Apostolica*, some lovely verses entitled *Rest*, which contained a protest against invocation:

"They are at rest:
We may not stir the heaven of their repose
By rude invoking voice, or prayer addrest
In waywardness to those
Who in the mountain grots of Eden lie,
And hear the fourfold river as it murmurs by." [2]

In 1841, three years before Mr. Keble's words:

"So unforbidden may we speak
An Ave to Christ's Mother meek"

were written, Mr. Newman published the ninetieth of the *Tracts for the Times*. In an argument marked by characteristic restraint he did not express any opinion as to the advisability of invoking the saints; but he maintained that the condemnation of "the Romish doctrine concerning" "invocation of saints"

[1] J. Keble, *Miscellaneous Poems* (1869), pp. 254-259.
[2] *Lyra Apostolica* (1836), LII.

in the twenty-second Article of Religion did not necessarily include rejection of the official Roman Catholic teaching on this subject. In the same year, 1841, Dr. Pusey, though with evident reluctance and with many cautious qualifications, contended that the argument used by Mr. Newman in *Tract XC* was valid, and that there was " no reason to think that our Article, in condemning 'the Romish doctrine' or 'the doctrine of the Schoolmen' on this point, had any reference to anything found in the early Church " ;[1] and in later years he steadily maintained the position that, while prayer to God for the help of the prayers of the saints was preferable to direct address to the saints themselves, the form of direct address to the saints, *Ora pro nobis*, was in accordance with the practice of the ancient Church and lawful in the Church of England.[2] And in 1867 Bishop Alexander Forbes, who, after Mr. Keble and Dr. Pusey, perhaps best represents the Tractarian theology, emphatically declared in regard to the invocation of saints : " In principle, then, there is no question herein between us and any other portion of the Catholic Church."[3]

The principles which the Tractarians accepted have been maintained by Anglo-Catholics. Probably there are few among them who question the lawfulness of invoking the saints, most of them practise invocation as an habitual devotion, and they agree in assigning a prominent position in their thoughts and

[1] *The Articles treated on in Tract* 90 *reconsidered and their interpretation vindicated in a letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D.* (1841), p. 109.

[2] The most important passages on this subject in Dr. Pusey's writings are quoted with references and dates in the present writer's *The Invocation of Saints* (third edition, 1916), pp. 59-64.

[3] Bishop A. P. Forbes, *An Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles* (third edition, 1878), p. 422.

prayers to the holy Mother of our Lord. The enthusiasm with which the refrain " Hail Mary, full of grace "[1] was sung by vast assemblies at the first Anglo-Catholic Congress in 1920 was to many the most impressive feature in the Congress.

In maintaining these principles many Anglo-Catholics have carried the observance of them and the practical issues from them further than was possible for the Tractarians. In teaching, in private and public prayer, in hymns, veneration of our Lady and invocation of her and the other saints have become very prominent. About the doctrine which underlies the practices, and about the main features of the practices themselves, there probably is little disagreement among those who may be grouped together as Anglo-Catholics. But a good deal of difference as to methods and as to emphasis may be observed, and on some important matters there are differences of opinion. It may suffice to give three instances, one of practice and two of belief.

Some Anglo-Catholics hold strongly that in expression as well as in thought all invocations of our Lady and of the saints should be restricted to the request for prayer. They would limit all such devotions to the words " pray for us," " pray for me." They have no difficulty in the complete form of the *Ave Maria*, " Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death " ; but they think it well that invocation should not exceed the phraseology here used. Others wish to use stronger phrases, as, for instance, the words of

[1] The refrain to the hymn beginning " Ye who own the faith of Jesus " by V. S. S. Coles in *The English Hymnal*, no. 218.

the well known hymn *Ave maris stella* in an unmodified form:

> " Virgin all excelling,
> Gentle past our telling,
> Pardoned sinners render
> Gentle, chaste, and tender.
>
> In pure paths direct us,
> On our way protect us,
> Till, on Jesus gazing,
> We shall join thy praising."

In using such phraseology those who think it right understand it in the way explained by the Catechism of the Council of Trent and eminent Roman Catholic divines, namely, that, if Catholics should say to a saint, " Have mercy on me," the meaning is " Have mercy by praying for me so that I may obtain gifts from God."[1] Those who hold the different opinion think that, if such explanation of the phrases is needed, the phrases are better not used.

An instance of doctrine is in regard to the conception of the holy Mother of our Lord. There are some who are prepared to accept the doctrine defined for Roman Catholics by Pope Pius IX that the Blessed Virgin was not only without actual sin but was also preserved free from original sin in the first moment of her conception by the unique grace and privilege of God in view of the merits of our Lord. Others reject this doctrine as being without authority and as having been invented to satisfy a process of reasoning that is dangerous and untrustworthy. To the present writer

[1] *Cat. conc. Trid.* IV, vi, 3, 4: cf. *e.g.*, Cardinal Bellarmine, *de sanct. beat.* i, 17.

the grounds for a positive decision on such a matter seem to be lacking. He can understand the fascination which the doctrine as a matter of arbitrary reasoning has for some minds, and he follows the great thinker and historian Dean Church in his view that "the dogma is itself an opinion which any one might hold, if he thinks that there are materials in the world from which to form an opinion about it"; but he agrees also that the dogma rests on "inferences from suppositions about a matter of which we know nothing."[1]

Another instance in regard to belief concerns the Assumption. Signs are not wanting that a few Anglo-Catholics believe that, after the death of the Blessed Virgin, her body was assumed into heaven so that she, both in body and in soul, is now in glory at the throne of God. Such an opinion, though widely held both in the East and in the West, has never been made to be of faith in any part of the Church; and the vast majority of Anglo-Catholics probably either reject it or regard it as one of those matters for the decision of which there is no sufficient evidence. The practical question of keeping a feast day—the fifteenth of August—as the day of the Falling Asleep or the Repose of the holy Mother is altogether independent of any opinion as to the bodily, or even the spiritual, Assumption. All Anglo-Catholics—and a great many who are not Anglo-Catholics—may well agree that it is natural and right to commemorate the death of the Mother of our Lord, as of other saints; and that, in accordance with the ancient custom which became universal, the fifteenth of August is an appropriate day.

Every Catholic wishes to declare the incommunicable

[1] R. W. Church, *Occasional Papers* (1897), i, 354, 355.

greatness and glory of Almighty God. This is a foundation of Catholic belief, without which the whole edifice of Catholic theology would fall in ruins, and the whole system of Catholic devotion would come to nought.

There are principles which have to be associated with this belief in the incommunicable greatness and glory of Almighty God. In God's dealings with mankind, high privileges have been bestowed on human beings, and gifts are granted by means of others than those who receive them. One man may be of service to other men; and one man may rightly be honoured by other men. Human lives are dependent on one another; and reverence is rightly paid by one to another. We do well to honour those who are good and unselfish and generous. What thus applies in ordinary life applies in a higher degree to the saints; for the saints are those who by the grace of God have been pre-eminent in goodness and unselfishness and generosity. And there is a further consideration in regard to the Mother of our Lord. She is not only the greatest of the saints, but also she has the unique position and privilege that she is the only being in the universe to whom the title Mother of God can be applied; she alone by the decree of the Almighty was chosen to be the human mother of the eternal Son of God when He became Man. She possesses, in Bishop Pearson's famous words, "that special privilege" "which is incommunicable to any other."[1]

And, when invoking the saints, the Catholic remembers the truth that the Church is the family of God. In the family of the Church, one member should

[1] Bishop John Pearson (died 1686), *An Exposition of the Creed*, p. 179 of the folio edition of 1669.

take interest in others, and have care for others, and pray for others. No sharp line can be drawn between the members of the family who are still on earth and those who have departed this earthly life. As we who are on earth do not cease to pray for those who are departed, so we cannot think that the departed have ceased to pray for those who are still on earth. The idea of all Christians, living and departed, as different members of the one family of God leads on to belief not only in the prayers of the living for the departed but also in the prayers of the departed for the living. And, if "the supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working,"[2] then the prayers of the saints, and of the saints departed, have their special value. Further, the unique position of the Mother of God, as it makes claims on the honour which we pay to her, has its effect also in the power of her prayers.

[2] St. James, v, 16.

CHAPTER XIV

THE LAST THINGS

A DENIAL or ignoring of any other state of the soul after death than heaven and hell was frequent in the English Church from the sixteenth century onwards. Archbishop Thomas Cranmer in his reply to the Devon rebels in 1549 urged that "The Scripture maketh mention of two places where the dead be received after this life, *viz.*, of heaven and of hell."[1] The homily on prayer published in 1562 contained the trenchant statement "neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers; but, as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer and the other is without redemption."[2] In the seventeenth century a theologian so far removed in many respects from either Cranmer or the writer of the homily as Bishop Pearson, while describing the state of the blessed dead before their resurrection as "partial life eternal," spoke of them as being "with Christ, who sitteth at the right hand of God."[3] Such

[1] J. Strype, *Memorials of Thomas Cranmer*, Appendix, p. 106 (edition 1694).

[2] *A homily or sermon concerning prayer*, pp. 299, 300 (edition Oxford, 1844).

[3] Bishop John Pearson, *An Exposition of the Creed*, p. 395 (edition 1669).

teaching may have been due partly to a revolt from ideas about purgatory current in the middle ages, and partly to the survival of a belief that an ideal Christian life would be followed by the admission of the soul to heaven immediately after death. Be that as it may, any conception of a waiting state was widely ignored, and was sometimes denied, by English Church people. And indeed such a phrase as to go to heaven has been used as synonymous with to die not only frequently by members of the Church of England but also sometimes by Roman Catholics.[1] If the use of it by Roman Catholics has been consistent with a belief in a waiting state, it certainly tended in the Church of England to encourage the idea that there is no such state, and that prayers for the dead are useless and wrong.

Neither a belief in a waiting state nor the use of prayer for the dead ever became wholly extinct in the Church of England.[2] But, when the Oxford Movement began in 1833, there were few for whom either the belief or the practice had much meaning. In the revival the Tractarians went slowly. Dr. Pusey in his *Letter to the Bishop of Oxford*, written in 1839, pointed out that they had not wished to make prayers for the departed " a topic in public discussion," and that in No. LXIII of the *Tracts for the Times* the subject had been mentioned only historically " as one of the points in which all the ancient Liturgies agreed "

[1] The writer has heard it so used in conversation by Roman Catholic friends; and there are instances to be found in books: see *e.g.*, expressions used by members of the Vaughan family in J. G. Snead-Cox, *The Life of Cardinal Vaughan* (1910), i, 29, 39, 40.

[2] See *e.g.*, instances covering a period from 1547 to 1820 in *Hierurgia Anglicana* (new edition, 1904), iii, 143-166. See also J. W. Legg, *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement* (1914), pp. 315-333.

without any " hint of regret at its exclusion " from the Book of Common Prayer or the expression of " any desire of its restoration."[1] The knowledge that the ancient Church had habitually and without any sign of hesitation prayed for the departed appears to have been the first influence which promoted the recall of the practice. It was soon reinforced by the moral and spiritual arguments by which prayer for the dead no less than for the living was shown to be a religious duty. Bishop Alexander Forbes in 1867, while laying his chief stress on the practice of the Church, wrote " the true doctrine . . . is founded on the tenderest and deepest sympathies of our common human nature. Mankind will not endure the thought that at the moment of death all concern for those loved ones who are riven from us by death comes to an end. . . . Infinite love pursues the soul beyond the grave, and there has dealings with it, in which we who survive have still our co-operation. To pray for the departed is a deep instinct of natural piety."[2]

With the restoration of prayer for the departed came the clearer recognition of the waiting state. Here, too, there were moral and spiritual considerations which reinforced the argument from history. The conviction that there are many who at the moment of death are not ready for admission to heaven, while it would not be just to condemn them to hell, had its weight ; and it is not surprising that the need of preparation for heaven after death was felt not least by faithful servants of God. It has been recorded of

[1] E. B. Pusey, *A Letter to the . . . Bishop of Oxford on the tendency to Romanism imputed to doctrines held of old, as now, in the English Church* (fourth edition, 1840), p. 186.

[2] A. P. Forbes, *An Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles* (third edition, 1878), p. 312.

Mr. Keble that "the prospect of such a preparation was an unspeakable comfort to him."[1]

The recognition of the waiting state and the use of prayer for the dead inevitably brought up the subject of purgatory. The word purgatory had an evil sound. It was associated in men's minds with horrible punishments, which seemed unworthy of God, with material fire, which seemed unsuitable for the chastisement of a disembodied soul, with mechanical ideas applied to the things of the spirit, and with the sale of Christian privileges. "The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory" was described in the twenty-second of the Articles of Religion as "a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." Consequently, the feeling against allowing a doctrine of purgatory was at first very strong. Yet, when the matter was seriously considered, it was seen that the word purgatory might be applied to any state in which there was cleansing, and that the evil associations were rather with particular ways in which a doctrine of purgatory had been expressed and with abuses than with any doctrine necessarily involved in the assertion of some kind of purgatory. In the ninetieth of the *Tracts for the Times*, published in 1841, Mr. Newman mentioned as illustrations three different doctrines "concerning purgatory," no one of which was "Romish," no one of which, therefore, was condemned by the Article, any one of which might be held in the English Church.[2] A similar attitude was adopted by Dr. Pusey, writing in the same year. He repudiated

[1] E. B. Pusey, *What is of Faith as to everlasting punishment* (1880), p. 118, note g.

[2] J. H. Newman, *Tracts for the Times*, no. XC (1841), p. 25.

the view of purgatory which he thought to be condemned by the Article; he said that he did not hold "that there is a purgatory for the purification of the saints"; and he maintained that "our Article does not . . . condemn all notion of a purifying process after this life, but one distinct system"; and, after his wont, he tried to give due solemnity and awe to the discussion by adding "If any collect from the impression of antiquity a general awe of what may pass between death and judgement, it may be that he will acquire more reverent thoughts of the exceeding holiness of God's presence, and reflect more earnestly as to the fruit of actions or courses of action, and learn to speak less peremptorily, one way or the other, where Scripture is silent."[1] Further reflexion led Dr. Pusey to more positive affirmations. Four years later, in 1845, he wrote that he could not "deny some purifying system in the intermediate state," and mentioned this as one of the "things in antiquity" which the course of study had enabled him to see.[2] His ultimate opinion was expressed in 1880, when he affirmed "a preparation of souls, by which, 'in entire freedom from the guilt of sin,'[3] with a will perfectly transformed into the will of God, and in continual union with Him, with a love perfected, pure, disinterested, diffused in their heart, assured of their salvation, comforted by angels, refreshed and their waiting-time shortened through the prayers of survivors and the sacrifice of the altar, they may cast off their slough,

[1] E. B. Pusey, *The Articles treated on in Tract* 90 *reconsidered and their interpretation vindicated in a letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf*, (1841), pp. 87-90.

[2] See letter quoted in H. P. Liddon, *Life of E. B. Pusey* (1893), ii, 457.

[3] A phrase quoted from St. Catherine of Genoa, *Treatise on Purgatory*, chap. 5.

and amid whatever processes of purifying it may please God to employ, and after whatever time, be admitted to the Beatific Vision of the All-Holy God."[1]

Gradually, the Tractarians came to affirm that the waiting state, after the particular judgement at death by which the eternal condition of the soul is decided, affords opportunity for spiritual cleansing and training as a preparation for admission to the Beatific Vision in heaven.

The widespread rejection of any kind of purgatory by members of the English Church in the sixteenth and following centuries was not accompanied by much modification of the corresponding ideas about hell which were inherited from the middle ages. Popular thought took it for granted that the unending pains of hell will include the material fire and the material worm as means of everlasting torment. The more cautious theologians spoke with some reserve, but the natural effect of their words was to encourage the popular belief. Bishop Pearson represents the best English theological thought of the seventeenth century, and the expressions which he uses would not suggest any other view of hell to the ordinary reader. For he speaks of the " pain of loss, the loss from God," " the pain of sense inflicted on them by the wrath of God which abideth upon them, represented unto us by a lake of fire," " the loss of heaven and the everlasting privation of the presence of God," " the torments of fire, the company of the devil and his angels, the vials of the wrath of an angry and never-to-be-appeased God."[2] The Tractarians, like others, inherited a way

[1] E. B. Pusey, *What is of Faith as to everlasting punishment* (1880), p. 121.

[2] J. Pearson, *An Exposition of the Creed*, pp. 394, 397 in 1669 edition.

of regarding the pains of hell which viewed them as material. In the course of time they came to see that the difficulties of this opinion were great. The issue of the considerations which were forced upon them may be seen in Dr. Pusey's conclusion that neither the affirmation nor the denial of physical sufferings inflicted by material fire and a material worm is of faith.[1] The Tractarians throughout held strongly to the Scriptural and traditional doctrine that the punishment of the lost is everlasting.

A further question about the lost, namely, who and how many they will be, can never be far from thought when the subject of eternal punishment is considered. In the early years of the nineteenth century the ordinary belief probably was that the lost would be many. A very sombre view was taken of the eternal state of the heathen, of unbaptized infants, of those who had not been given opportunities of Christian belief and life, as well as of those who had neglected opportunities and refused good of which they knew. This view owed something to traditional Catholic theology, and it had been hardened by Protestant teaching and thought. To some extent the sombreness of this opinion was lightened by the Tractarians, though the general sternness and gloom which accompanied much of their work did not tend to relieve it. Readers of Dr. Pusey's sermons will notice that the terrifying severity which marks some of them is for the rich, for those who know, for those who have opportunities, and that it is his way to be considerate towards the poor, the ignorant, and those whose opportunities

[1] E. B. Pusey, *What is of Faith as to everlasting punishment* (1880), p. 23.

have been few and small.[1] In 1880 he clearly expressed what in substance he had said before, " We know absolutely nothing of the proportion of the saved to the lost or who will be lost ; but this we do know, that none will be lost who do not obstinately to the end and in the end refuse God. None will be lost whom God can save without destroying in them His own gift of free-will."[2] Two years earlier, in 1878, the whole question had been faced with extraordinary candour and balance and judgement by the Dean of St. Paul's, R. W. Church. Preaching on the text, " Then said one unto Him, Lord, are there few that be saved ? "[3] Dean Church brought out with unequalled power the different lines of thought which are suggested by the New Testament, and ended with an impressive appeal for trusting the justice of God.[4] In this sermon may be seen the finest fruit of the Oxford Movement ; and it should never be ignored by any who want to know what the ultimate direction of the Tractarians was.

The Anglo-Catholics of to-day began where the Tractarians ended. To many of them the popular beliefs of the early nineteenth century would be almost inconceivable. They have inherited the results of long thought on the part of the Tractarians, and they have been affected by many influences of a different kind. The writings of Frederick Denison Maurice and Charles Kingsley and Frederic William Farrar have made a mark. The general temper of recent years has pressed more hardly on Anglo-Catholics

[1] See *e.g.*, the sermons entitled " Why did Dives lose his soul ? " preached in 1865, and " The losses of the saved," preached in 1866, collected in the volume *Lenten Sermons* (1874).

[2] E. B. Pusey, *What is of Faith as to everlasting punishment ?* (1880), p. 23.

[3] St. Luke xiii, 23.

[4] R. W. Church, *Human Life and its conditions* (1878), pp. 97-124.

than any analogous circumstances pressed on the Tractarians. But they, like the Tractarians, are unable to relinquish the truth that there may be such deliberate and final rejection of God, such deliberate and final choice of evil, as must make restoration impossible. To this truth they are inevitably led by the teaching of Holy Scripture, the tradition of the Church, and the consideration that man's free will may eternally choose evil and that the holy God cannot take to Himself those who will not depart from sin.[1]

Prayer for the departed is an accepted practice with all Anglo-Catholics. It is thought to have support in particular expressions,[2] and still more in the general tone, of Holy Scripture.[3] It has been the ordinary usage of the Christian Church in public worship and in private devotion as far back as there is evidence. It is demanded by considerations of reason. If there is survival after death, reason suggests that the life before and after death is continuous, and that such help as may be afforded to those still on earth through intercessory prayer cannot be denied to the departed.

The present century has seen a great revulsion in English opinion about prayers for the dead. To a

[1] Apparently very few Anglo-Catholics accept the suggestion made by Bishop Gore that the punishment of the lost may be such a dissolution of personality as will bring with it the cessation of personal consciousness. See his *Practical Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans* (1900), ii, 212; *The Religion of the Church* (1916), pp. 91, 92. A similar suggestion was made by Mr. Gladstone: see his *Studies subsidiary to the works of Bishop Butler* (1896), pp. 172-198, 260-267. The difficulty which the present writer finds in such a view is due to (1) the solemnity of our Lord's warnings, (2) the horror of the state of the lost in the mind of the Church, (3) the improbability that God will recall from any soul the personal consciousness which He has given.

[2] II Macc. xii, 41-45; II St. Tim. i, 16-18: cf. iv, 19.

[3] St. Matt. xxii, 32; St. Mark xii, 27; St. Luke xx, 38; I St. Peter iii, 18-20.

large extent the South African war of 1899, and to a far greater extent the Great War of 1914, shook popular prejudices, and drove English people to prayers for those whom they mourned. So far as the events of the time have promoted earnest prayer, the results have been altogether good; but a not unnatural effect of the distress and sorrow caused to human love has in some cases tended to impair the solemnity of the decisions made in the present life. For the present life is the only revealed time of probation. God in His unerring wisdom and unfailing love takes into account all the circumstances and all the opportunities or lack of opportunities of each soul. He knows and understands all that has been seen or unseen in each life. His judgement, exercised at the moment of death, is not subject to the imperfections or misconceptions of our human judgements. But, so far as there is revelation, and so far as the belief of the Church has discerned, the probation of each life is ended at death. The Catholic prayers for the departed are not prayers for a new probation, or for the reversal of what has been in life on earth, but for the gifts of God to the souls in whom, whatever their failures and imperfections and sins, He has found something which He can accept.

Anglo-Catholic theology, then, regards the moment of death as the time of the particular judgement, that is, the judgement of God on the individual soul. After death is the waiting state. About it we know little. Our understanding of its nature and its conditions is necessarily limited. Of it experience can tell us nothing. We can form no idea what the life of a bodiless soul is like. We believe that the departed are living; for our Lord has told us so. We believe

that they can be helped by our prayers; for otherwise the whole historic witness of Christian worship would mislead us. We can understand that, as in this life, progress may require some kind of pain; that a clearer discernment of what the events of this life have meant may deepen sorrow for past sin; and that the preparation for the Beatific Vision of the All-Holy God may need a discipline no less real because it is wholly spiritual. Such discipline may be called penal, since all suffering borne by a soul which once has sinned is part of the punishment for sin. It may be said to be purifying, since all chastening rightly endured has cleansing power. If any have gone further, and have used images of material things, such language can be justified only as the metaphorical speech which may suggest realities which it fails to describe.

The waiting state is the prelude to the new life of body and soul united by the resurrection. What the details of the resurrection will be like we cannot tell. Here, again, our ignorance is great. But the Church is committed to the truth that the future life will have the fulness which body adds to soul, and that the essential quality which makes one body the possession of one soul through all material changes from childhood to old age will be for ever preserved. The Catholic of to-day will not get much further than the description by St. Paul that the future body will be uncorrupt and glorious, powerful and spiritual; he may free himself from the embarrassments which have hampered truth in too many carnal conceptions of the resurrection which have been too prevalent; he may regret that the earnest endeavour of some Greek theologians to preserve the teaching of St. Paul

long had an influence less wide than the attempts to model the heavenly life on an earthly pattern; but he knows that he cannot abandon the doctrine of the resurrection without falsifying the New Testament as well as parting company with the creeds of the Church.

Neither have we any detailed knowledge of what heaven is. Such knowledge, like that of the waiting state and of the resurrection, is outside our present capacity. "It is not yet made manifest what we shall be";[1] and the revelation to us of that which we are to enjoy is made in figures and images not easy to understand. But we know of future conformity to the divine will and pattern: "We shall be like Him";[2] of fellowship with others in the life of the city of God;[3] of abiding service: "His servants shall serve Him";[4] of the sight of the incarnate Son of God: "We shall see Him as He is";[5] of admission to the Beatific Vision: "They shall see His face."[6]

[1] I St. John iii, 2.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Rev. xxi, xxii.
[4] Rev. xxii, 3.
[5] I St. John, iii, 2.
[6] Rev. xxii, 4.

CHAPTER XV

CONCLUSION

IT has been emphasized more than once in the foregoing pages that there are differences in opinion and differences in practice among Anglo-Catholics. It may be well to add here two further illustrations relating to matters of practice. The first is in regard to the fast before Communion. There is no difference among Anglo-Catholics that the historic custom of the Catholic Church prescribes that for priest and for people no food of any kind is to be taken before Communion. It is agreed, again, that this custom is of moral obligation for members of the Church of England who accept the authority of the Universal Church. It is agreed, also, that for persons near death it is lawful to receive the Holy Communion when not fasting. But, if we go on to further statements, a difference arises. There have always been those both among the Tractarians and among their successors who have held that other exceptions to the ordinary rule than the exception for dying persons ought to be made, and that those recovering from illness, or chronic invalids, or some in ordinary weak health, might rightly communicate after food. Of those who have maintained this opinion, some have held that each such exception should be made subject to the permission of the bishop of the diocese; others have

allowed that this permission is not necessary. In the last few years the position of those who have thus believed that the rule of keeping the fast before Communion allows of certain considerable exceptions has been strengthened by the attitude adopted in the Church of Rome. A hundred years ago, the Church of Rome maintained its traditional law that the relaxation of the fast before Communion in any individual case required a dispensation from the Pope, and this dispensation was rarely given. During the last twenty-five years some change has been made. It is understood that in the early years of the twentieth century the papal dispensations were given more frequently than had been the case formerly; in 1906 and 1907 the sacred congregation of the Holy Office allowed individual confessors to grant them; the revised canon law of 1917 recognized that individual confessors might allow liquid food to be taken before Communion by some in ill health; and in 1923 the congregation of the Holy Office permitted the celebration of Mass by priests who had taken some liquid food other than alcoholic in circumstances which make the observance of the fast specially difficult. There are, then, Anglo-Catholics who hold that, in view of the divine command to receive Communion being of higher obligation than the Church's rule of the fast before Communion, of occasional exceptions to the rule known to have been allowed in the early Church, of the relaxations in the Roman Catholic Church, and of permissions granted in the Churches of the East, the need of maintaining the fast before Communion cannot be without exceptions other than the case of the dying. On the other hand, some Anglo-Catholics hold that the law against receiving

food before Communion has so fully had the sanction of the Universal Church that only a formal decision of the Universal Church could free any from the obligation of observing it.

The second instance is in regard to the marriage of the clergy. The historical facts are well known. In the early Church married men were permitted to be ordained priests, but priests were not allowed to marry after their ordination. In the Eastern Church the broad features of this rule have been maintained with the added regulation that the unmarried priests are in monasteries, the parish priests are from those who have been married before ordination, and the bishops are selected from the unmarried priests. In the Church of Rome the early prohibition against marriage after ordination has been extended so as to prohibit also the ordination of the married except in the case of Easterns in communion with Rome. In the Church of England the allowance that those already married may be ordained has been extended so as to allow also that those who have been ordained may marry. In view of these historical facts, and of considerations of a different kind, three different opinions are held among Anglo-Catholics. There is the opinion that the Church of England has been right in allowing priests to marry as well as the married to be ordained, since married priests were recognized both in the New Testament and in the later history of the Church, since there is no fundamental difference between marriage before ordination and marriage after ordination, and since what thus is theologically and ecclesiastically tenable has the support of grave moral considerations. There is another opinion that the prohibition of marriage after ordination is of such universal

authority that no authority less than universal can alter it, and that the ancient custom still preserved in the East ought to be maintained. There is a third opinion that the Church in the West acted within its powers and acted rightly in prohibiting the ordination of the married (apart from certain exceptional cases) as well as the marriage of the ordained, and that therefore the present practice of the Roman Catholic Church is right. Each of these three opinions has its advocates among Anglo-Catholics at the present time.

These two instances have been selected because they bear intimately on practical life, and because the different opinions held about them indicate some differences of outlook. But it would be a great mistake to suppose that these and other differences imply any real want of unity among Anglo-Catholics. In reality their coherence is very strong, and their agreement about fundamental principles very great.

It would also be a great mistake to suppose that the only or main interest of Anglo-Catholics is in matters of theological definition or ecclesiastical observance. They would be wholly misunderstood if they were thought to care only or chiefly for the externals of religion. Even the sacramental system which fills so large a place in their theology and practice is a part of a much larger whole. The sacraments are what they are because of their dependence on what is more fundamental. They fit into a whole method of belief and life. For the Catholic religion is not a series of doctrines and maxims and rites which are separable from and independent of one another. There is a great body of Catholic truth and practice, to the whole of which Anglo-Catholics recognize their responsibility.

It is a trust which has been committed to the Church by Almighty God Himself. The doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, of the Atonement, of the Holy Ghost and the Church and the Sacraments, of the eternal issues of life, make up the great factors in that trust. Subsidiary doctrines, maxims for life, rites to be observed, are the consequences of these great truths. If circumstances have led to undue emphasis or wrong proportion or any neglect on the part of Anglo-Catholics, this must be ascribed to the faults of individuals and not to anything in Anglo-Catholicism itself.

Anglo-Catholics are sometimes charged with being too self-centred, too indifferent towards social evils and wrongs, too little eager for the conversion of the heathen or for the spread of Catholic truth among other Christians. Whatever may have been true in this charge at particular moments, at any rate a great effort has been made to remedy the defect. Since the time of the first Anglo-Catholic Congress in 1920, there has been missionary enterprise of many kinds, and representative Anglo-Catholics have done much to promote converting and spiritual movements. The Anglo-Catholic Congress Committee, the Society of St. Peter and St. Paul, the promoters of the "fiery cross," and of many conventions for priests, have certainly shown abundance of enthusiasm and vigour. And indeed the charge was never true of Anglo-Catholics as a whole. The devoted labours of many parish priests in England, much evangelistic and pastoral work abroad, the Society of St. John the Evangelist, the Community of the Resurrection, the Society of the Sacred Mission, many communities of women, testify that this is so. That an increase of zeal is to be desired

may not be denied. It will not be reached by depreciating what already there is.

Rumours are sometimes heard that it will go hardly with Catholics in the Church of England at the hands of authorities. It is inconceivable that anything should be done to render the position of the main body impossible. The members of it are too numerous, they are too strongly entrenched, they have made themselves too valuable to the general work of the Church, they are too much in touch with some in high office, for any attempt at excluding them from the Church to succeed. It is more likely that any policy of exclusion will aim rather at making a division among Anglo-Catholics, at separating those who are thought to be more extreme from those who are considered more moderate, at making things easy for the more moderate and unsufferably hard for the more extreme. The probable result of such a policy would be to rally all who are called "High Churchmen" to the defence of those thus attacked.

That Anglo-Catholics will not be found unreasonable if treated with understanding and sympathy may be illustrated from the discussions which have taken place about the revision of the Prayer Book. For many years after revision was first seriously proposed, all projects for it were steadily opposed by Anglo-Catholics. They held that, whatever imperfections there may be in the existing Prayer Book, the balance of advantage was in its being preserved unaltered. Two circumstances had influence in promoting a different policy. First, it became clear that some kind of revision was almost certain; and the opinion grew that, if there was to be revision, Catholics ought to show of what kind they desired it to be.

Secondly, there were some—chiefly liturgical students or the younger parish priests—who had come actually to wish for a revision. The change in policy which thus came about under the pressure of circumstances found expression in the year 1922, when the English Church Union, hitherto the opponent of revision, put forward proposals for the consideration of the Church Assembly and Convocation which were popularly described as the "Green Book." The general policy which underlay the innumerable details in the proposals was thus described:—"Liturgical chaos is an existing fact, which cannot be brought to an end by coercive measures. It is not practically possible to enforce the rigorous observance of the present Prayer Book, nor, if such enforcement were possible, would it be very congenial to many of ourselves. And the doctrinal differences which exist within the Church of England make it impossible to substitute by general agreement any one other Rite in the place of the Prayer Book as solely obligatory. There is, therefore, in our opinion, no other course open to 'Catholic-minded' members of the Church of England than frankly to resign themselves to an era of liturgical experimentation and 'alternative Rites.' . . . . The policy, therefore, which commends itself to us is that of asking for the inclusion, amongst the permissible alternatives, of those rites and usages which are dear to us. We desire, in short, to ask the authorities of the English Church and our fellow-Anglicans to extend frank and complete legal recognition to the expression of Catholic faith and practice, as embodied in our suggested amendments. But we do not wish to force Catholic ideas or usages upon anyone. Coercion, even if we were in a position to exert it (which we

are not), is always and necessarily futile in such matters : we only desire to display the English Catholic idea in its full practical embodiment. We have deliberately refrained from demanding the excision of some alternatives which are uncongenial to ourselves, but are obviously designed to meet the views or susceptibilities of others. We disclaim any wish to compel ' Evangelical ' or ' Central ' Churchmen to say or do things which they do not want to say or do ; we merely ask for permission to say and do the things which we do desire to say and do. May we not hope that other sections of the Church will meet us in the like spirit of generosity, confident that ' Truth is great, and must eventually prevail ' ? "[1]

The proposals thus made were at first uncongenial to a good many Anglo-Catholics. These felt that in some respects the proposals gave them less than they had been accustomed to use for many years, that they would be on stronger ground if there were no alternative to the existing Prayer Book, and that the suggested toleration of what others wanted would be a mistake. But it soon became clear that, notwithstanding some such misgivings, if the proposals made by the English Church Union were authorized as a whole, Anglo-Catholics, with remarkably few exceptions, would cordially accept and honestly use the alternatives thus provided. In the judgement of the present writer, both the proposals themselves and the way in which they were regarded showed signs of a reasonable temper and a conciliatory spirit. It is still his conviction that the authorization of the " Green Book " would do more to remove difficulties and

[1] *Report of the Committee on Prayer Book Revision* (Office of the English Church Union, 1922), pp. 3, 4.

promote peace and order in the English Church than almost anything else of which he can think.

By some means or other the practical policy of our rulers must find a way of tolerating the Anglo-Catholic section of the English Church. But, the history and circumstances of the English Church being as they are, those who are thus tolerated must in their turn tolerate others. It was a mark of the policy adopted by authorities in the English Church and State during the reign of Queen Elizabeth to allow within the National Church men of most widely differing opinions, on the one hand those who were almost Roman Catholics provided they did not hold a doctrine about the Papacy inconsistent with the supremacy of the crown, and on the other hand those who were almost Puritans provided they would outwardly conform to the regulations of the Church. This policy differed much from the policies of intolerance adopted in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI and Queen Mary; it was open to objections from very different quarters and of a very serious kind; at least it held the English Church together and kept possibilities open; with various modifications it has remained the policy of the English Church ever since.

To such toleration there must, of course, be limits. But, so far as the present writer is able to form an opinion, the limits will be preserved rather as those who ought not to be within them remove themselves than as they are coerced or forcibly excluded. In his judgement any who so far accept the doctrines of the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope that their position in the English Church is really untenable will in time find this out for themselves and will act accordingly; and, in a different quarter, those who

have definitely rejected the certain teaching of the creed to which the Universal Church is committed will come to recognize that their right place is not within the historic Church. On all sides now, there is great need for patience, for sympathy, for care to deepen rather than to uproot. And to the great work of a renewed Christendom, powerful to grapple with falsehood and injustice and moral evil, the English Church has its contribution to make, and, within it, Anglo-Catholics have theirs.

Ne reminiscaris Domine delicta nostra vel parentum nostrorum.

INDEX

INDEX

Affinity, 76-78
Anglo-Catholics, 1, 4, 5, 7, 103-112, and *passim*
Apostolic Constitutions, 65
Articles of Religion, 47, 85, 94, 95
Atchley, C., 48
Atonement, 13, 14

Baptism, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30-33, 57
Bellarmine, Cardinal, 87
Blessed Virgin Mary, 81-90
Brontë, C., 1

Cæsarius of Arles, 65, 66
Canons of Hippolytus, 65
Catherine of Genoa, St., 95
Ceremonial, 3, 39-41
Chrysostom, St., 65
Church, The, doctrine of, 15, 16, 18, 19
Church, The, members of, 16
Church, R. W., 88, 98
Coles, V. S. S., 86
Confession, 24, 26, 28, 29, 57-63
Confirmation, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30-33
Cosin, Bishop J., 47, 48
Cranmer, Archbishop T., 91

Decretum, 47
Divorce, 76-79
Duns Scotus, 74

English Church Union, 109, 110
Eschatology, 91-102
Eternal Punishment, 97-99
Eucharist, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 34-56, 57, 73, 74

Farrar, F. W., 98
Fast before Communion, 37, 103-105
Forbes, Bishop A. P., 68, 69, 70, 85, 93
Frere, Bishop W. H., 48

Gladstone, W. E., 80, 99
God, Christian doctrine of, 7-9
Gore, Bishop C., 99
Grace, 30, 31

Hagenbach, K. R., 27
Harnack, A., 27
Hauler, E., 65
Headlam, Bishop A. C., 72, 73
Hemerli, F., 51
Heaven, 102
Homily on Prayer, 91
Horner, G., 65

Incarnation, 10-13
Innocent I, Pope, 65
Intermediate state, 91-96, 100, 101

James, St., Epistle of, 64-66, 90
Justin Martyr, St., 45

Keble, J., 52, 77, 81-84, 94
Kingsley, C., 98

Legg, J. W., 92
Liddon, H. P., 95
Lock, W., 81, 82
Lyndwood, W., 47, 48

Magic, Sacraments not, 24-26
Marriage of Clergy, 105, 106
Matrimony, 24, 26, 28, 29, 76-80

Maurice, F. D., 98

Newman, J. H., 1, 84, 85, 94

Orders, Holy, 24, 26, 28, 29, 71-75
Original sin, 12, 13

Pearson, Bishop J., 89, 91, 96
Perry, T. W., 48
Pius X, Pope, 79
Pope, authority of, 19, 20, 111
Prayer Book revision, 108-111
Prayer for the dead, 91-93, 99, 100
Puller, F. W., 66, 73
Purgatory, 94-96
Pusey, E. B., 52, 59, 63, 77, 85, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98

Reservation, 45-56
Resurrection, 101, 102
Re-union, 20-22
Roman *Church Order*, 65

Sacramental principle, 23-27
Sacraments, how symbols, 27
Sacraments, not magical, 24-26
Sacraments, number of, 28, 29, 79
Saints, 81-90
Scripture, Holy, 16-18
Serapion, 65, 66
Strype, J., 91
Swete, H. B., 74, 75

Thiers, J. B., 51
Thomas Aquinas, St., 74, 75
Thurston, H., 51
Toleration, 111, 112
Tracts for the Times, 1, 71, 72, 92, 94
Tractarians, 1-4, 7, and *passim*
Transubstantiation, 37-39
Trent, Council of, 38, 79, 87
Turner, C. H., 27, 74, 75

Unction of the sick, 24, 26, 28, 29, 64-70

Vaughan, Cardinal, 92

Wakeman, H. O., 5

MADE AND PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY THE BOWERING PRESS, PLYMOUTH

DATE DUE

MAR 0 1 2002

DEC 0 8 2007

FEB 1 6 2004

DEC 07

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

5100
S7 Stone, D.
The faith of an
English Catholic

BX
5100
S7

319733

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

BX5100 .S7 GTU Library
Stone, Darwell/The faith of an English C G
3 2400 00059 1598